

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXXVI, No. 12
WHOLE No. 901

January 1, 1927

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	271-274
EDITORIALS	
A Benison on the Reader—The Pontiff and Civil Authority—An Apologist for Calles—The Slaughter of the Innocents—Washington, Marlborough and Hughes	275-277
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Yellow Gold—An English View on Church Collections—The Pope and the Royalists—The Magi: "Their Science, Their Theology"—The Federation of Colored Catholics	278-284
SOCIOLOGY	
An Archdiocesan Council and the Immigrant	285-286
EDUCATION	
The Klan at Harvard	286-287
POETRY	
Twelve O'clock	287
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	288
LITERATURE	
The Magi Arrive	289-290
REVIEWS	290-292
COMMUNICATIONS	293-294

Chronicle

Home News.—On December 20 the text of the pending treaty with Panama was made known. The importance which this little Republic assumes in case of war is made plain by a paragraph which constitutes the heart of the treaty. In the first place, the Republic of Panama agrees to cooperate with the United States "in all possible ways" in the protection of the Canal. In case of any war in which the United States should become a belligerent, the Republic agrees, on request of the United States, to "turn over to the United States, in all the territory of the Republic of Panama, during the period of actual or threatened hostilities, the control and operation of wireless and radio communications, aircraft, aviation centers, and aerial navigation." In all military operations in any part of the Republic, the United States shall control. In time of peace the armed forces of the United States shall have entry into Panama "for maneuvers or other military purposes," provided due notice be given the Republic of Panama. Possible conflict between these provisions and the League Covenant is foreseen by some members of the Senate who have already given interviews to the press.

On December 18, Chairman Butler, of the Naval Affairs Committee, introduced a building program, under-

stood to have the support of the President, and interpreted as a warning that if Great Britain and Japan propose to proceed with cruiser-construction the United States is able to keep pace with them. The heart of the program is the proposal to spend approximately \$140,000,000 for the construction of ten 10,000-ton cruisers. Under the terms of the bill the President is authorized to suspend the building of the cruisers "in the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments." On December 20, the Senate committee agreed to the bill, and it will probably become a law by the end of January.

A voluminous report on the administration of alien property during the War was submitted to the President by Comptroller-General McCarl. A copy was sent first to Senator Borah, chairman of a committee appointed to investigate what the Senator once called "the worst sinkhole of iniquity in the Government's history," and on December 22 was transmitted to the Senate. Some phases of alien-property administration have already been aired in the courts, but the New York *World*, an anti-administration paper, hints that the worst is yet to come; this, however, is denied by the Comptroller.—Senator Harris, of Georgia, asked for an investigation of the alleged sale of Federal offices, in the postal and other departments, in several Southern States. His request was supported by Senator Norris, of Nebraska, who would extend the investigation to the entire country. In a committee meeting Senator Ernst, of Kentucky, a Republican, countered by asking an inquiry into the disfranchisement of Negro voters in the South.

Forty-two professors of the Faculties of the Political Science and allied schools of Columbia University in the City of New York issued a statement on December 19, advising a reconsideration of the problem of the war debts. The Faculties fear that "insistence on debt-payments will cause the hatreds which European countries are finding means to allay among themselves" by mutual concessions "to be concentrated squarely against us." Cancellation of the debts is not urged, but "readjustment on a basis of justice and generous intention." On December 21, the President allowed it to become known that the Columbia statement did not greatly appeal to him at this time when the debt terms were still pending in Congress and in the French Parliament. His policy of payment according to ability to pay remains unchanged, and he refers to his

address before the United States Chamber of Commerce on October, 1924: "We are opposed to the cancellation of debts due us from abroad, and shall continue to seek their further liquidation."

Czechoslovakia.—A significant manifesto was issued to its constituents by the Slovakian Popular party, which recently left the Opposition to take its place in the Government ranks. The document summed up the existing position of Catholics and the new hopes entertained by them. After mentioning the Socialist and anti-religious trend of the former Administration, the Slovakian Catholics recognized the changes that had taken place. Because, moreover, the Government was prepared to meet the Slovakian demands for Home Rule half way, the party indicated it would cooperate with it to realize its own program. Some good results were already obtained. Thus the Slovakian language is to assume its rightful place in the public offices and in the schools of Slovakia. In the religious field the anti-Catholic bias, which had been poisoning public life, is to cease. The relations between Church and State are to be those existing between equal and freely contracting parties. Bishops appointed by the Holy Father are to be recognized by the Government, and Church property belonging to them, but hitherto administered by the State, is to be handed over to them. Teachers of denominational schools in Slovakia will be placed on the same footing as teachers of Government schools. The document continued:

By voting for the estimates we intended to give the Government an opportunity to show whether they are in earnest with their program. We have done that all the more willingly as all the bourgeois parties have now seriously decided to carry out the principle of autonomy for the several parts of the Republic. They thus approach the solution of the Slovakian problem and take the first step towards the realization of Home Rule according to our program.

These were considered most important concessions. In regard to making Home Rule effective the first measure agreed upon was the extension to Slovakia of the same degree of self-government enjoyed by the older parts of the Republic. Thus, little by little, the Slovakian Popular party may fill important posts in the political, cultural and economic administration of Slovakia.

France.—The Prime Minister Poincaré had to face considerable criticism for his alleged delay in securing the immediate stabilization of the paper franc. The rise in

Budget Voted for 1927

its value resulted naturally in a rise in prices, curtailment of business and industry, and some degree of unemployment. Concerning the latter however, accounts conflicted and the Council of Ministers considers some of the statements that have been made in that connection as exaggerated. "Revalorization," says the prominent French financier, Octave Homberg, "will take twenty years. Stabilization is the thing, in order to restore economic equilibrium." The Premier however replied to his critics by action, on the supposition that the stabilization of the franc has as

its essential basis the balancing of the budget. For the first time in forty years, the French budget was voted before Christmas. At 3 A. M., on December 19, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies agreed on the 1927 budget, which calls for 39,728,310,792 francs in receipts and 39,541,443,921 francs in expenditures. Premier Poincaré's motto has been "economy in expenditure and the fullest possible yield from existing taxes."

Germany.—On December 17 the Marx Cabinet was forced to resign owing to an adverse vote of 249 to 171 on a lack-of-confidence motion introduced by the Socialists. The latter were supported by the Nationalists, the Communists, the reactionary Voelkische party and the Industrialists. Only the democratic Middle parties supported the Government. Dr. Gessler, against whom the Socialist motion was mainly directed, had been charged with building up the army along Nationalistic rather than Republican lines, with secretly purchasing ammunition, and with having illegal relations with the Soviet Government. While the Nationalists' vote made possible the Socialist victory, they differed entirely from both Socialists and Communists in their reasons. They had previously demanded several portfolios in a reconstructed Cabinet as their price for supporting the Government. This Chancellor Marx told them would be impossible and in refusing them took the consequences. After the vote he immediately proceeded to hand in the resignation of his entire Cabinet to President Hindenburg. Negotiations were then opened with Dr. Luther, who was abroad, to return instantly and consider taking the Chancellorship. Neither the foreign nor the domestic policy appeared likely to be greatly changed by these events. Dr. Gessler, too, will probably remain Minister of Defense. For the last three years there has been a Cabinet crisis each Christmas.

Ireland.—The Bill for the Amendment of the Constitution, introduced by the Government, passed all the readings in the Dail without the slightest opposition. This

Changes in Constitution

Bill does not contain all the amendments that are deemed necessary or even advisable; it postpones the consideration of further amendments to the next Dail. The principal amendments made by this Bill are: the abolition of a general holiday on the polling-day of a General Election; the release of the speaker of the Dail from the necessity of contesting a seat, on the principle that he belongs to no party and is not provided for by the system of proportional representation; the extension of the duration of Parliament from five to six years; and the power to increase the maximum numbers of the Executive Council from seven members to not more than twelve. The most significant of these amendments, says our correspondent, is the last named, since it indicates definitely that the non-party spirit of the Constitution is considered unsuitable to the conditions of Irish politics.

The first meeting of the conference required by the Constitution for the settlement of naval relations between Great Britain and the Irish Free State was held in London. After a preliminary discussion, it was decided to adjourn the conference until March next. These deliberations concern Article 6 of the Anglo-Irish treaty. According to this article, the defense by sea of Great Britain and Ireland shall be undertaken by his Majesty's Imperial Forces, until such time as the Irish Free State undertakes her own coastal defense. The article prescribed that a conference between the representatives of the two Governments should be instituted within five years from the date of the treaty with a view to the undertaking by Ireland of her share in her own coastal defense.

The Department for Industry and Commerce has issued a report showing an increased employment of 9,080 persons, due to the protection afforded Irish industries.

Economic Position

It is not made clear whether or not this increase in certain industries is balanced by a decrease in others. No exact statistics of the figures of unemployment in the Free State are available; during the debates in the Dail the total of unemployment was variously estimated at from 22,000 to 70,000; a conservative estimate places the total at about the mean of these figures. Trade continues depressed; for the ten month period, January to October, there was a decrease both in exports and imports over the corresponding period for 1925, though there was a slight improvement in the so-called adverse trade balance.

Jugoslavia.—Premier Uzunovitch found it impossible to reach an accord with the various parties and resigned the task of forming a new Cabinet. The King then charged ex-Premier Lioba Davidovitch, leader of the United Democrats and Bosnian Moslem parties, with this undertaking. Meantime the political situation had become still more tense by the retirement of the Catholic Slovenians under Dr. Korosetz, on the claim that the Serbian parties had refused to meet their terms or do anything for Slovenia. Previously M. Raditch, the Croatian leader, had similarly retired with his party. M. Davidovitch, who is strongly for recognition of Soviet Russia, had slight chances of forming the "concentration Government" the King desired.

Lithuania.—Early in the morning on December 17 a military *coup d'état* was carried out successfully at Kovno. Without any bloodshed the insurgents, under

Anti-Red Revolution

General Antona Smetona, who had been the first President of the Lithuanian Republic, took possession of the entire Government machinery. The reason assigned was that the previous Government, under President Grinius, had made no attempt to thwart the Communists, who were said to be financed from abroad and to have been preparing for a Bolshevik coup. Efforts were made to establish the

new Government on an entirely legal basis. In the first place Premier Glezevicius was induced to resign and President Grinius to authorize Professor Valdemaras to form a Ministry according to the Lithuanian Constitution. Parliament was called, the Right groups alone answering the summons, and the resignations of the former President and Speaker were received and approved. M. Smetona was next elected President and M. Stuigansky, a former President of the Republic, was chosen Speaker. M. Smetona formally took the oath to stand by the Constitution. A few days later Professor Valdemaras, who is both Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued a statement accusing Poland of attempting to organize a Communistic revolt in Lithuania, in order that it might intervene and ultimately destroy the independence of the little Republic. Lithuania, he said, will never renounce its claim to Vilna, now held by the Poles.

Nicaragua.—Official announcement was made that the Government had refused the offer of Guatemala to mediate the difficulties between the opposing factions. It was stated that Diaz had been recognized by all important countries. The latest Central American Government to recognize him being Salvador. In discussing the reliance of his Government on the United States for support against the revolutionaries, President Diaz was quoted by the Associated Press as saying:

I accepted the Presidency of Nicaragua, expecting that the United States would aid Nicaragua to restore order and secure peace. The day after my inauguration, therefore, I appealed to the Government of the United States, soliciting its support for the solution of the present crisis and to avoid further hostilities and invasion on the part of Mexico.

Since then two expeditions have come to the shores of Nicaragua. Arms, munitions and personnel from Mexico have been landed and the Liberals sent to set up a government.

I am confronted with the question, if the aid which I expected is not received, whether it will not be better in order to save lives and the industries of Nicaragua, to deal with President Calles direct now.

I cannot believe, however, that the United States Government will stand aloof and allow Mexico to overthrow a Nicaraguan Government recognized by the United States and recognized under the conditions which existed.

The Nicaraguan Government can quite easily dominate any revolution by Nicaraguan Liberals alone, knowing their inferiority in numbers and resources. But a Nicaraguan Government supported by ninety per cent of the people could not permanently withstand a revolution made by ten per cent, aided by arms, money, supplies and military personnel furnished by the Mexican Government.

My Government can carry on alone for a month or two against the Mexican-aided revolution, but, if left unaided against Mexico, the latter should win.

Panama.—The proposed treaty between Panama and the United States and the Claims Commission made public in summarized form last July, was formally presented to the National Assembly for ratification on December 16. President Chiari submitted the compact to the legislators without any personal comments stating that he de-

United States Treaty

sired to let them free to discuss its approval or disapproval. Subsequently in an interview in *El Tiempo* he was quoted as saying in answer to a question as to whether he personally was satisfied with the treaty:

I would be completely satisfied if Panama could have obtained all we desired. As you understand, in negotiations of this kind it is not possible to obtain the maximum of the concessions desired by both parties. The points of view of one and the other are not exactly the same.

He expressed the belief that the new treaty was better than the old because of its more definite language. He said further:

Attention may be called to the fact that the new treaty does not close the doors against new negotiations in the course of time. By conducting ourselves seriously, governing ourselves judiciously, establishing between Panamanians and Americans ties of mutual intelligence and confraternity and sincere, loyal friendship, with a true spirit of helpfulness and cooperation, as fortunately this administration has been practising, we may be able to obtain later what has not been possible at this time. We must be convinced that this is the only reasonable, patriotic policy for Panama in its relations with the United States, and I shall not depart from that line of conduct so long as I have the responsibility as head of the Government.

Commenting on the treaty the Paris press appeared somewhat hostile but the London *Observer* had this to say:

In so far as concerns America it is America's affair. In so far as it concerns the rest of the world, its effects are likely to be beneficial. The Panama Canal is an important highway for British commerce. Its full control by the United States will give as much confidence to the world's shipping as corresponding British control has been proved to give to the Suez Canal.

President Chiari is of opinion that President Coolidge has enough friends in the Senate to obtain the approval of the treaty in the United States.

Rome.—The allocution of the Holy Father at the secret consistory held in the Vatican Palace on December 20, excited by its pronouncements on matters of far-reaching import, more attention perhaps than any previous utterance of Pius XI on questions touching Church and State.

At the consistory, held for the purpose of elevating to the Cardinalate Mgr. Giuseppe Gamba, Archbishop of Turin, and Mgr. Lorenzo Lauri, Pope Pius' successor as Nuncio to Poland, the Holy Father mentioned as reasons for rejoicing during this last year the several beatifications, the Eucharistic Congress at Chicago, the Franciscan celebrations and the consecration of the Chinese Bishops. Speaking of the situation in Mexico, he remarked that the persecution, which has continued there for months with "inhuman ferocity," is reported recently as becoming even more cruel. For France, he urged union on religious grounds. Although free to follow by legal and honest means any legitimate political program, the French Catholics should unite in defense of the Church and its Divine rights of Christian matrimony, of the family, of schools, of Christian education—in short of all the most sacred and fundamental liberties.

In accord with his recent warnings concerning the principles of the *Action Française* are the Pontiff's plain

words which then followed concerning the Fascist conception of the State. He mentioned the intense excitement and the events that followed the unfortunate attacks on the life of Premier Mussolini, characterizing it as "the mad attempt against the life of the man who with such exemplary energy governs the fate of the country as to make us believe that Italy herself is in danger whenever he is endangered." In spite however of the thanks offered to God for his escape, another storm broke out:

Neither the sanctity of churches nor the venerable dignity of Bishops, nor the sacred character of priests was spared. Blind hate caused good Catholics to be treated like enemies of law and order. With wicked cunning the best and most fervent Catholics were singled out for the harshest treatment.

Declaring the Pope's words at once "a revelation and a challenge," the *New York Times* for December 22 rightly designates as the most essential of his declarations those words in which he expresses grave fears as to the Fascist monopoly of individual liberties, particularly their claim to an exclusive control of the education of youth:

Our confidence however is not yet either full or sure. This we say especially with reference to religious interests which are recognized to be, as indeed they are, one of the supreme interests of our people. A dark threat seems to hover and hang suspended over our "Catholic action" organizations, which are the apple of our eye. We again see a conception of a State making headway, which is not a Catholic conception because it makes the State an end unto itself and citizens mere means to that end, absorbing and monopolizing everything.

Official utterances of the Italian Government are reported as understanding the Pope to refer to the Fascist *Balilla* and vanguard organizations, which are intended to train boys between the ages of 8 and 18 for their eventual entrance into the Fascist party or the Black Shirt Militia. Premier Mussolini was said to be hastening the publication of the new statutes of the *Balilla* to prove that there is no foundation for alarm. Nevertheless, it was stated that the Government did not intend to depart from its policy of controlling the education of youth, which it considers a fundamental right provided by the Fascist conception: "Everything in the State, everything from the State, nothing outside of the State."

For the past few months readers of AMERICA have been charmed by the writings of G. K. Chesterton. Next week an American newspaperman, Andrué Berding, will allow that celebrity to charm us with his personality itself, through the medium of an interview with him.

The Marlborough case is ancient history, but in "The Missing Knot," Jerome D. Hannan, D.D., unravels a few of the remaining tangles.

Alfred J. Brickel, from a professorial chair at St. Mary's, Kansas, will apply a little logic, adapted to satire, to H. G. Wells' "Outline of History."

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 1, 1927

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS

Editor-in-Chief

JOSEPH HUSSEIN

PAUL L. BLAKELY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN

Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00

Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

Publication Office, Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

A copy of the Index for Volume XXXV of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, Grand Central Terminal, New York City.

A Benison on the Reader!

THERE was once a campaign orator who after a hard day on the hustings was asked to address a clerical group "in just a few well-chosen words." "I have n't," he replied with a charmingly disarming smile, "a single well-chosen word in my entire system."

Even in the peaceful Christmastide, a closed season for editors, an editor may find himself in a similar predicament. But to express his best wishes to all the readers of this Review, and to pray that the New Year may bring them every temporal and spiritual blessing, is no burden. It is a happy privilege. Our readers are a family scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific; indeed they circle the globe and, after the manner of the British drumbeat, greet the morning sun with a copy of AMERICA in their hands! We appreciate their many kindnesses, and bearing in mind what the Scriptures say of the blows of a faithful friend, we welcome their criticisms. These bind us together all the more closely. Since our Latin is small, we dare not affirm that the Roman poet was referring to lovers' quarrels when he sang of *redintegratio amoris*, but we are told that nothing so cements affection among young folks as an occasional difference of opinion. And even in the best regulated of families, does not an occasional tiff clear the air and thus restore good feeling on a stronger basis?

But we would not stress the martial note. We love our readers, and if their inveterate habit of renewing their annual subscription can be taken as a norm, they too love us. We hope we can be of some use to them, and we know that the aid they give us is beyond price. Hence to paraphrase Father Ronald Knox, we are resolved that we shall have no more of their pies than they of our prayers.

God keep us all! We have fought many a battle side by side in the cause of truth. May He give us keener vision for all that is good and pure and true, deeper and more self-sacrificing love for one another, and above all, that abiding peace, founded in love, which the world cannot give.

The Pontiff and Civil Authority

THE complete text of the Papal allocution of December 20 has not reached this country, but several paragraphs published by the metropolitan press repeat a teaching of the Catholic Church which will commend itself to every citizen interested in the preservation of good government. Referring to certain abuses in Italy, the Pontiff condemns the concept of the State which "makes the State an end in itself, and citizens mere means to that end, absorbing and monopolizing everything."

This false concept has entrenched itself so deeply in this country that it has become a serious menace to our constitutional form of government. For more than half a century a political philosophy wholly at variance with American principles and ideals has been taught in a majority of our secular colleges and universities. The result is the acceptance of an over-lord State, the source of all rights and the sanction of all duties, and a legalistic concept of morality which makes the legislature the supreme norm of right and wrong. Flowing from these false principles is the contention that every human activity should be placed under the control, or at least the direction, of the State.

Thus we are forced to contend against continual encroachment by the State upon the family, the child, the school, and, in general, upon all agencies for education and for the relief of the sick and the needy. This encroachment makes itself felt in education more sharply than in any other field. Possibly a majority of Americans, particularly of non-Catholic Americans, admit without examination the theory that education is primarily the right and duty of the civil authority. Yet the original American theory, recently sustained by the Supreme Court, asserts that the right and duty to educate the child belongs primarily to the father. The fact that the ruling in the Oregon case surprised anyone, indicates how completely an old American principle had been forgotten.

Generally speaking that is the wisest form of government which promotes in the citizen a conscientious desire to defend his rights and to live up to his duties. Such was the government which the framers of the Constitution hoped they had established. They supposed that the citizens of the States would always be jealous of their rights and quick to fulfill their duties; within the last decade, however, a most pernicious tendency to shift their burdens upon the Federal Government has been noted in a number of States. The ultimate conclusion of this tendency is the most highly-centralized bureaucracy that ever cursed a people.

We expect the Federal Government to act as school teacher and wet nurse; to build our bridges and to construct our roads; to function as a general censor of private habits; and from an inexhaustible purse to subsidize all local projects and expenditures. We have made the civil power an end in itself. We have allowed it a beginning which must end by making the citizen a cog in a creaking governmental machine. The State does not exist for the citizen, say our reformers, but the citizen for the State. The American concept of Government reverses that relationship.

It is time to trace our steps back to the original principles of the American scheme of government, to principles singularly in accord with the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Man is a human being before he is a citizen. As a human being he has rights which no government may destroy, and duties which he must not permit the Government to assume for him. Tyranny may invade his rights, as in Mexico today, or they may be gradually alienated by clothing the State with undue control. And that is the danger in the United States today.

An Apologist for Calles

IT is interesting to note that Mr. William Randolph Hearst has lifted his voice in favor of peace with Mexico. But it does not seem likely that amicable relations can long be maintained if we follow the plan which he proposes. It is, in brief, to overlook the trifling peccadilloes of Mr. Calles and his henchmen, to speak kindly of them, to acknowledge them as men who despite their disregard for the law of God and of nations are patriots battling for religious and economic freedom. It is not a gospel of love but of doddering sentimentality that Mr. Hearst proposes. True, we ought to love even a bank-burglar; but a cashier ought to remember that if he loves the bank-burglar more than the burglar loves him, he is apt to be taken at a disadvantage. After all, exclaims Mr. Hearst, things are not so bad in Mexico; the worst that can be said is that the present Government "is, perhaps, somewhat ultra-Socialistic."

We are accustomed to associate Mr. Hearst with roaring and with headlines in red ink; but here he roars as gently as any sucking dove, and the red ink shades into a delicate lavender. If this gentle spirit ever wrote of Bluebeard, he would not venture beyond the mild assertion that as a husband his manners "were, perhaps, somewhat unconventional," and at that he would stand aghast at his hardihood. Now Mr. Hearst knows as well as the rest of us that "ultra-Socialistic" is a word that does not apply to the Mexican Government, and we can contemplate a contingency which would move him to bid the business managers of his journals order unparalleled supplies of red ink. For Mr. Hearst is a zealous stickler for property rights, we think, at least when his own property is in question.

The splendid Pastoral of the Episcopate has exposed to the American people a faithful picture of the

orgies of blood and license daily perpetrated beyond the Rio Grande in the name of freedom. In the Allocution of December 20, Pius XI refers to "the persecution which has continued for some months with inhuman ferocity and impiety, and is now becoming even more cruel." In the name of a Constitution, never submitted to the people of Mexico, a document which does not represent their wishes, edicts are issued which violate their most sacred rights. Freedom of worship is a mockery when worship is controlled by impious men whose careers prove beyond cavil that they hate religion. Freedom of education is a myth when no one may teach, even in private, except by "permission" of the Government, when no mother may teach her little child to say its prayers, and when the only school permitted is one which violates the conscience of parents. As we claim these rights for ourselves, so we may not look with indifference on the spectacle of a group of revolutionaries seeking to destroy them. Much less may we by any act permit the impression that we view it with approbation.

The apologists for the Mexican delirium are forced to fall back on the theory that no man has any rights which a majority must respect. Apart from the fact that the ruling group in Mexico can produce nothing to show that it represents the wishes of the majority, it is not probable that the American people will long be deceived by a falsehood as impious as it is offensive to their concepts of decent government. The Mexican Government made a fatal error in professing its willingness to be judged at the bar of civilization. On every count the indictment is sustained by an outraged public opinion. If there is freedom in Mexico, then every American ideal of freedom must be summarily rejected; if there is justice in that unhappy country, what the courts of civilized countries have hitherto rated as justice is rank persecution.

The Slaughter of the Innocents

"OUR modern criminals do not lack academic education," remarked District Attorney Dodd at a meeting of parents, school teachers and social workers, recently held in Brooklyn. "Many have had the benefits of a high-school and college training. What we need today for the young is more home life and more religion."

If the factors singled out by Mr. Dodd could be brought into the experience of our boys and girls, the results would undoubtedly make themselves noted in a decrease in crime and a corresponding increase in good citizenship. But the problems connected with the task of establishing a home in our great cities daily become more difficult. In the crowded precincts of the tenements, space now rents for a sum which twenty years ago, and in cities of moderate size today, would secure a mansion. Hence the poor must get along as best they can in a few rooms which provide most of the absolute necessities but none of the conveniences of life. Their dwelling-place is not truly a "home," but only a place in which

they sleep; in which they eat two meals a day; it is four walls and a roof. The family do not gather about the fireside, to find their enjoyment in simple domestic festivities. There is no fireside, but only a kinky coil of pipes through which the steam now faintly creeps, now rumbles unmusically. The young people have no place in which to receive their friends; consequently they betake themselves to the cheap theater or to the poolrooms, with their often degrading associations, or they gather at the street corner. Deprived as they are of the sweet memories of home—a challenge and a support for upright living second only to the sustaining power of religion—these poor young people have lost something for which complete compensation can never be made.

As to religion, much can be done by the good example of parents, but while essential, mere example is not sufficient. In a day when evil flaunts itself, our young people must be taught how to meet and overcome it. This means that they must be adequately instructed in the truths of religion, and be trained to live a code of morality, based upon religion. Mr. Dodd, as a jurist of experience, realizes that "education" is not enough, especially when that "education" ignores man's chief interest in life.

Step by step we retrace the path back to Catholic principles in education. We have tried the secularized type for eighty years and more, and we find that it is worse than inadequate. As Dr. Weigle of Yale has said, not only does it omit religion, but by that omission it leads the child to conclude that after all religion is of minor importance. Early impressions are deep and lasting. The child without religion is generally the citizen deprived of the strongest incentive to good citizenship.

Washington, Marlborough and Hughes

"I FOUND 297 statements in the book which are absolutely false, and 111 which are extremely doubtful. The book is full of slurs and snarls based on the internal consciousness of Rupert Hughes, and of expressions of the way Rupert Hughes would have acted. It is very plain the author does not know what he is talking about." Such, in brief, is the criticism recently offered a Boston audience of Rupert Hughes' life of Washington, by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, who began to teach history at Harvard more than forty years ago.

With an accuracy that is nothing short of amusing, the same criticism fits an article published by Mr. Hughes in the New York *American* and allied journals on December 19. As the article is brief, some adjustment in the statistics may be necessary, but in essaying to discuss the Marlborough case Mr. Hughes makes it abundantly plain that "he does not know what he is talking about."

When will these smart paragraphers learn that the Canon Law is a legal code which requires in one who would interpret and apply it a highly technical train-

ing, the first step of which is accurate knowledge of what the law is? We doubt very much if Mr. Hughes would undertake to qualify as an expert in whooping-cough, for instance, or in the ordinances which govern push-cart licenses in the City of New York. But the Canon Law has no terrors for him, precisely because of the reasons pointed out by Professor Hart. He bases his conclusions on "the internal consciousness of Rupert Hughes" and on the manner in which "Rupert Hughes would have acted." This method makes for brilliant flashy writing, but not for accuracy or truth. For instance, Mr. Hughes does not appear to grasp the distinction between an act which professes to annul a marriage, and an act which declares that there is no marriage to annul. The Canon Law makes that distinction, but Mr. Hughes, who evidently has never heard of it, continues to repeat that, in the instance which he reviews, a marriage was "annulled." The Canon Law is not allowed to speak for itself; the case is tried and decided by the bizarre concept of the law which Mr. Hughes evolves from his inner consciousness. And he rises to a climax of inaccuracy in the subjoined paragraph:

And here is a great church proclaiming that where there is no love there is no marriage. . . . Now that a church has recognized the right of a bride to declare, long after her children have grown up, that she did not love their father after all, and now that the element of love is recognized as vital to the sacrament, a great step has been taken toward liberalization.

Here is a lamentable looseness in the use of terms. Whether she has grown-up children or no children, a bride does not need the permission of the Church to state that she did not and does not love her husband. She is bound only by the mandate bidding her speak the truth, and by a decent regard for the feelings of others. Nor has the Church proclaimed "that where there is no love there is no marriage." The principle on which the Rota decided the Marlborough case is that under certain circumstances coercion (*vis et metus*) makes the marriage contract null and void from the beginning. In other words, the law of the Church declares that the free consent of the contracting parties is required. Denial of this common-sense principle means that free consent is *not* necessary, and the consequence of this is the contention that men and women can be married against their will.

Mr. Hughes is so evidently at sea in this matter that it is impossible to know precisely what he means by "love." Hence it is well to observe that the bride and groom obviously cannot promise that the mutual attraction, esteem and affection which they entertain will persevere throughout life, and that, consequently, no promise of the kind is asked. But they can maintain for life what they promise at marriage—fidelity to a contract which death alone can dissolve. Esteem may pass and affection grow cold, but even in the ruins of departed love the fidelity to one's pledged word that makes death preferable to dishonor can be kept—and must be. Else man who can touch Heaven falls back to Hell.

Yellow Gold

MARY GORDON

THIS is a difficult tale to tell. It is a true story. Vicarious expiation and corroding regret tread the boards of my every-day life in a way that is anything but pleasant. Try as I will I cannot successfully banish them.

I was sixty-three years old last Thanksgiving Day. Born in northern Wisconsin, close to the Minnesota line, I like every stick and stone of the little town wherein I grew to womanhood.

I had five brothers and four sisters. My father was a bit too easy-going; too much of a "hail fellow well met," while my mother, tall and dark and silent and kind, seemed to lean to penuriousness. This is not said to malign them. They gave us a good home, saw to it that we received the religious instruction that was to be had in those days and locations and taught us by example rather than by precept. I speak thus simply to cast a brighter light on what I am going to say about myself.

I shot up rapidly into a dark, robust, flashing type of a girl, and when blond Jimmie McGraw, who stood six feet in his socks, turned the corner of my life's road and looked at me with his sea-green eyes my heart turned a complete somersault. At least, I thought it did! With the ardent imagination and youthful impatience of an untrained girl of seventeen (we married younger in those days) I married him after six months acquaintance. I married him, you quite understand, with my good parents' knowledge and consent in our pretty little parish church, traveling nineteen miles over roads that were not exactly like the cement highways of today, to have the ceremony performed. My husband was honest, clean-living, ambitious and very much in love with his wife. He put me in charge of his heart and of his home. I was the vice-president and financial secretary and what I did met with his quick approval.

Our first anniversary was marked by the birth of a son. My steady, hard-working husband's joy seemed to know no bounds. But I was not happy, nor had I been when I knew that God had blessed our marriage, when I knew first that a child was to be born of our union. Almost the first thing I thought of was the expense. I stressed this phase and right there I sowed the seeds of a life's remorse. Thinking of expenses became a habit, and like all habits, whether good or evil, it flourished like a green bay tree.

We had ten children: eight sons and two daughters. All of them were born strong and well. All of them started to grow up with strong minds in strong bodies.

The years were not kind to me. I can see now that the fault was mine. I was too stingy. It hurt me to spend. My husband was never out of work and he stuck to his

habit of turning his pay envelope over to me, unopened. Always I have been the manager of our home.

At times, in bitterness, I thought the years were changing my husband not for the better. Some sort of coarsening material seemed to have spread over him. He drank. Not heavily, but regularly and he did not stay at home more than he had to. Silence deepened and widened between us. It never occurred to me I was to blame; that my love of money turned him away from his home and his nice family of growing children.

Steadily I kept putting money in the bank. A good habit this, but I overdid it. Our income did not permit me to save the sum I did—not in justice to our children. Running to the local bank with one or two or three or four or five dollars was really the biggest joy of my life; looking at my bankbook gave me more pleasure than doing work for my family. I did not plan for their future save to wonder just how soon I might safely start them earning. As they grew, the attendant expense blotted out all the wonderful plans that God means every mother to know and enjoy. God's plans found little response in my heart. My vision was all unknown to me (well, no . . . not exactly all unknown), becoming warped, distorted.

Our first son lived thirty-two years. He died after a four-days' illness of pneumonia, down in New Jersey, where he was clerk in a large hotel. He was not married, and truth compels me to admit his life left much to be desired, from a spiritual point of view. He is buried in the East as I would not consent to his father bringing his body home.

Our second son has five children. They too live in the East. None of them attends our schools although the large city they call home is well supplied with them. Our fourth, fifth and sixth sons are single. Two of them live in New York City. One is a successful real-estate man; one a street-car conductor. They do not come home and very seldom write. Our sixth son is not well and long ago our family doctor told me he never would be well.

I do not like our family doctor. He knows me too, too well. Knowing me, he despises me. He told me flatly that insufficient food of the right sort, in youth, had made of this son a man not fitted in body or mind to take and keep his place in the line of battle that men, to live, must wage. One son died at the age of four. Later the doctor told me that had I loosened up and spent some of my beloved cash the boy would probably have lived. Our oldest daughter is married to a man, not of our Faith, who is in the paper-hanging and painting business. They own their own home, have two sons and a baby daughter, born two weeks back. They live in our town, and yet . . . they seldom

come home. My husband goes often to them and is completely "sold out" to the children.

Our youngest girl left home when she was ten. I mean that I, thinking to cut down expenses, secured for her a place as nurse-maid in a family of wealthy, estimable people, not of our Faith. Two years later they moved to Chicago taking her with them. She was her father's girl, through and through and through, and often he upbraided me for being so insistent that she remain away from home. Today she is teaching in Chicago. She almost idolizes her father, and comes home every Christmas and each summer vacation; not to remain. She is lavish in her gifts at home. At first she gave cash, but changed when she realized that I put it all in the bank. Her gifts have swung to the practical class. She is engaged to be married to a rising young lawyer with the wedding scheduled for this coming June. They plan to be married in Chicago.

Three of our boys never made their First Holy Communion. They attended instructions with their classes, but were missing from the ranks on the Great Day because I had not provided clothes. Each time I fought a long drawn out battle with myself; a losing one. I could not bring myself to draw out any of the money I had deposited, in my own name, in the bank, to purchase the little suits so sorely needed.

Their father was ignorant of facts until too late to do anything. Gold was my god. Religion had become of secondary importance. I preferred sitting with my bank-book in my hands to saying my rosary.

One son remains to be accounted for. That bonny boy of ours, born the Fall I was forty-four, went straight to my heart and grappled there. More than anything or anyone in the world I loved him . . . I thought. He came between me and my passion for gold with insistent and disquieting persistency. I wanted him to have a college education but I could not bring myself to face the fact that I would have to spend to aid him in securing the same.

His father, grown weary no doubt with years of useless remonstrating was silent on the subject, with me; silent and morose. Back and forth in my heart the battle waged and to my shame be it said . . . gold won.

The early Fall that marked Bob's fourteenth birthday he contracted a cold that persisted in clinging. One snowy night in November he came in from his paper-route wet, cold, hungry, shivery and very ill. He asked for the doctor. I put him to bed with hot tea and a promise to call the doctor in the morning, if it would be necessary. Night calls, you see, cost more. One week from that day we buried him. Our old doctor came, sent for a priest friend of his, and our boy who had never made his First Communion until then, received the Last Sacraments.

I have never been able to erase from my memory the night Bob died. Young, ambitious, and in spite of home conditions gay, he drifted slowly and not willingly out upon the uncharted seas of Eternity. I could not believe he was dead; that his smile, his gaiety and his youth were forever gone. He has been dead five years.

For me to wander down dim alleys in the Land that

Might Have Been is not a happy pastime. I have seventy two hundred dollars in the local bank but I have not one member of my family who loves me. How could they?

After Bob's death I attended a Mission in progress in our town and started in to try to be what God intended a women to be. It is a hard task. Habit is a stern taskmaster and my mode of living has been the cause of so many souls being outside the Fold.

I have been a selfish, dollar-chasing women. I now begin to realize that shrouds are made without pockets. Would a check for \$7,200.00, that I have spent my life in acquiring, purchase for me eternal happiness? My false god was Yellow Gold.

An English View on Church Collections

RONALD KNOX

Copyright, 1927

THERE is one Catholic institution, of which no reasonable doubt can be entertained that it is primitive, and indeed almost structural—the collecting of alms.

Saint Paul, among all his other representative qualities, was certainly the first in a long line of successful beggars; and it may reasonably be supposed that, were he alive today, his Collection for the Holy Places would have a column in the *Universe* every week. Five or six chapters in his epistles he devotes to this subject alone; and it is difficult not to feel that Rom. xv. 26, is a broad hint, signifying his intention of coming down on the Romans later on.

I have called him a successful beggar; I would not call him a shameless beggar. On the contrary, any allusion to the subject seems to involve him in an agony of embarrassment. I do not always think of St. Paul as fairly represented by that eighteenth-century writer who asserted that "in him was happily united whatever could distinguish or adorn the scholar, the gentleman, and the Christian." I do not feel certain that St. Paul himself would have liked to find his qualifications stated in that precise order. But he was, plainly, a man delicately minded, who feared intensely the imputation (probably already made) that Christian missionaries were out for what they could get.

What is it, this curious thrill of discomfort some of us feel about any mention of religion in connection with its temporalities? It is true that the suggestion of a *quid pro quo* in such matters lends a handle to the satirist and the proverb-maker; "no penny, no *Paternoster*" is an ungracious saying, and "they shall have no more of our prayers than we of their pies, quoth the Vicar of Layton" has also its disedifying side.

Yet we have good Scriptural warrant for not muzzling the ox that treads out the corn; and I fancy we converts—or rather, we convert parsons—derive something of our squeamishness about the support of pastors from the traditions we learned in the Establishment. That institution,

happy in the enjoyment of endowments—it skills not whence derived—could afford to make the Sunday collection a sort of hurried afterthought at the end of Divine worship.

There was, indeed, in Anglican churches of the old style, considerable parade about the actual process of offertory. The procession of sidesmen was, to some of us in our childhood, the thrilling point in the service. To see which of our grave, frock-coated friends were present, to speculate why others were absent, to invent (I regret to say) nicknames for them, to admire the way they paired off (generally a very tall one walking with a very short one), this in itself was an excitement. And when the chancel steps were reached, and the curate came forward with the huge brass bason (a seemly bason, I think the prayer-book called it), you waited to hear the chink of your own threepenny-bit as it fell into the heap, and felt that it was safe at last, *en route* for the Communion Table.

But a later prudery, strangely considered "Catholic," has driven all this into the background; little green bags with crosses on them are tactfully insinuated under the worshipper's nose; there are no more frock-coated processions up the nave. Indeed, in some country churches whose porches I have inspected, I find that the collection has disappeared altogether, and a "free-will offering scheme" has been substituted, somehow connected with envelopes.

No such mealy-mouthedness is observable in our own recusant conventicles. The importance of a special offertory is warmly emphasized in the weekly notices; one has even heard of its insufficiency being the matter of subsequent comment. The oratorical fervor with which these sentiments are expressed is unaffected by the allocation of the funds raised, whether they be for the poor, or for the Chinese babies, or for the repair of the presbytery roof. The sting of the appeal is not the urgency of the need which has to be met, but the duty of the Faithful to give. Nor is the actual collection of the alms made a postscript to the service; it enters into its structure, and disedifies, sometimes, our non-Catholic friends by taking place "at the most impressive moments of the Liturgy."

Amongst my own congregation a tradition exists, uncommon, I fancy, elsewhere, of allowing the worshipper to take change out of the plate for anything up to a pound note. Yet the accumulated results are not solemnly wafted into the chancel and laid up somewhere at the East End. They disappear unceremoniously into the sacristy, and the only approach to a procession takes place in the Rector's sitting room immediately afterwards. Though, indeed, I have known a Highland church where the alms were left lying about in the sacristy on the ground that the priest "would be back on Thursday"—but I have told that story before.

The truth is, I think, that absence of endowments breeds an absence of constraint in this matter. A priest can take up a collection for himself—if need be, with his own hands—with far less *gêne* than is experienced by his

Anglican opposite number in urging the claim of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

The priest assumes cheerfully that, as an institution, he is himself a deserving object; the parish clergyman feels, somehow, a trifle in the wrong, as if he ought to have been able to repair the heating-apparatus out of his own pocket, but in these hard times it can't be done. One might have expected that, as a result, the parish clergyman would be on easy terms with his flock, whereas the priest would be shunned by his own parishioners as little better than a cormorant. Notoriously this latter supposition is untrue; the laity have a strange attitude, humorous without satire, of complaining to the priest that he is draining their last penny out of them, and at the same time cheerfully handing over their last-but-eleven.

What would be still more difficult of explanation, if we believed in the fallacy of the "economic man," is that honest pride in giving which is so characteristic of the Catholic poor. A hundred priests will tell you of people who are indifferent and occasional Mass-goers, yet will hold it a mortal insult if their house is not visited by the open-air collector. I have been assured by men wedded to holy poverty that, in their mission experience, a devotion to the weekly offertory begets a higher degree of spirituality in a parish. "Grand old Martin Luther" seems to have recognized this principle in his fable of *Date and Dabitur*, but it is doubtful how far he understood its application.

God forbid that I should embroil myself in the debate as to whether we Catholics need, in England, more lay administration of finance. Doubtless it would be a return to a pre-Reformation model; but it is to be remembered that we had endowments then. Certainly it might have its advantages, in clearing away the ground for Pharisaical scandal which the non-Catholic finds in our pews, rents, plates at the door, second collections and all the other paraphernalia of Catholic almsgiving. There are parishes, too, heavily crippled with debt, where the priest would have more time to attend to the word of God if he were not forever "serving tables."

But I should feel a certain sentimental regret at the disappearance (to which lay finance must tend) of that curious *personal* relation which exists between the priest and his flock in money matters. It is, I think, a matter of common human psychology that mankind reacts with less willingness towards the Bishop's scheme than towards Father So-and-So. As I say, I would not prejudice the discussion; it is a balancing of one good against another. But so long as our present free-and-easy methods prevail, let us not be blind to the merits of that warmhearted personal charity which is so largely due to them.

I hope that we priests feel, as we should, a combined sense of shame and responsibility when we contemplate the generosity of the poor. Nothing could be better calculated to remind us of what we are, and what is expected of us, than such demonstrations of confidence from the laity.

There is a kind of sacramental quality about those pennies; they are symbols of a sentiment and a tradition. It takes the commercial sting out of the Vicar of Layton's remark, quoted above, if we reverse it in the form: "We

shall have no more of their pies than they of our prayers," and I think it might be a suitable inscription for a presbytery mantelpiece if we wrote up "No *Paternoster*, no penny."

The Pope and the Royalists

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

TO all those who believe that the Catholic Church is given to political scheming, we recommend the study of two recent documents which have not only caused prolonged discussion in France, but bear also on world-wide problems of Church and State. For if political advantage is the ultimate aim of the Papacy, why did Pope Pius XI express so severe a warning against a group whose avowed aim is to restore the Church in France to the fulness of its former privileges and glory?

The *Action Française* is the official organ of the Royalist party of France—a party avowedly hostile to the present liberal and infidel elements in the French Government, and comprising a good proportion not only of the aristocracy as such, but of the best element in French Catholicism. The two principal spirits, however, both of the party and its official organ, *viz.* Charles Maurras and Léon Daudet, present a strange anomaly. As far back as 1914 Pope Pius X was concerned over the professed agnosticism, the total disavowal of all Christian and moral principles, and the loose, even lascivious writings, of these two extraordinarily able men, who nevertheless champion the Church, and all its juridic rights, as the sole means of establishing civilization and order in France. So pointed were the inquiries made by groups of Catholic young men, especially in Belgium, as to the fitness of following Maurras as a leader, that Cardinal Andrieu, the Archbishop of Bordeaux, published on August 27 of this year, in his diocesan paper, *L'Aquitaine*, an unequivocal answer to their questions.

If the directors of the *Action Française* were concerned only with purely political questions, if they were content to seek the form of power best adapted to the temperament of their country, I should say to you at once: you are free to follow their teaching. . . . But the directors of the *Action Française* are not solely occupied with political discussions of the form of government, and of the political rules of its exercise. In the presence of their pupils they take up many other problems which directly concern the teaching power of the Church, which the members of the Church in so far as she is subject to teaching, be they priests, princes or directors of the *Action Française*, cannot handle, if the teaching Church, represented by the Pope and the bishops, does not give to them proper authorization. . . .

The same distinction between a merely political program and a definite *school* of political science is pointed out by the Pope, in his letter of September 7, whereby he approves of the warning of Cardinal Andrieu, expressing at the same time the fear that the writers in question have

"imbibed, like so many others, the poison of those very schools of rationalist teaching which they themselves are combating." Happily, though, the words of the Head of the Church were not spoken in vain, for they were followed by an immediate protestation of loyalty on the part of the students of the *Action Française*. Lest, however, these young men should content themselves with their undoubted good intentions, short of actually breaking relation with Maurras and his fellow-leaders, the Holy Father reminded them in a later communication that "when it is a question of dangers, and particularly of dangers to Faith and morals, the first rule to follow is to remove oneself from them as far as possible."

This brief statement shows, in a simple outline, the nature and main reason for the warning given to these young Catholics.

A further study however of the documents and their discussions reveals certain vital Catholic principles which touch, one or the other, on nearly every question that bears on the public policy of the Church at the present day, whether they concern the social order, education or politics and international relations,—not to speak of some that touch on the interior, spiritual life of Catholics.

The Holy See definitely abstains from endorsing any particular form of government, whether it be a democracy, an aristocracy, or a monarchy. The Royalist form of government, despite its thousand years of devotion to the interests of Catholicism, its saintly kings, queens and noblemen, has no more claim, as a form of government, to the loyalty of Catholics, as Catholics, than has a purely republican régime. No matter how favorable any particular government may be to the Church, the Church is not thereby committed to its purely political principles. Not that the Holy See does not give full credit to past and present rulers for favors showered upon the Church and her ministers, and for an open-hearted patronage of Catholicism. Such credit, freely given, is freely acknowledged and esteemed at its full value. But the Church is not obligated by such favors, nor committed to this or that purely political system.

Still less does the Holy See wish to be committed to any form of extreme national aspirations, while recognizing the legitimacy of national aspirations as long as they are within due bounds. The Pope wishes the leaders of the people, be they Royalists or Republicans, to look beyond the particular national group that they represent to

the interests of humanity at large. As M. Georges Guy-Grand comments in the *Quotidien* for October 20: "There is a conflict between nationalism, on the one hand, which places the nation above all, and knows no other law than 'reasons of state,' and international or supranational politics, Catholic in the strict sense of the word, which opposes to 'reasons of state' the *reasons of humanity* or the *reasons of truth*."

Hence the famous Royalist slogan, *Politique d'abord!*—"Politics first!"—is not the first, but the last sort of idea to recommend to Catholic youth in the face of the real anti-religious warfare now being waged in France. And the Pope is speaking to youth. As the anti-Catholic critic, M. Charny, points out, he uses the word "youth" seven times in his letter. To tell any group of young men, naturally impatient of restraint and eager for action, that their first duty to God is to wield the shillelagh, and then leave to Providence the job of bringing the bloody crowns to confession, is a program that will surely go! But where will it wind up?

Quite a different program is that recommended by the Holy Father to the youth of France, as their only rational procedure under present circumstances. Leaving to political leaders to settle the question of the form of government as best they may, he calls on French youth to throw themselves heart and soul into the great work of the spiritual regeneration of the French people. Instead of wasting their energies to carry out the plans of men who are suspected of being "Catholics by calculation, but not by conviction," he advises those young men who are favored with the advantages of higher education, wealth, talent, or other worldly advantages to work for the "popular Apostolate," for the Christian education and social betterment of the young workingmen of France. The French boys who tramped through Umbria this summer with Father Donceur, on his pilgrimage to Assisi, were told to go out to the slums of Paris on their return, face the hoots and jeers of the Reds, and teach overgrown children to bless themselves and know there is a God in Heaven.

The leaders however of the *Action Française* acknowledge and even boast that they have withdrawn French youth from these activities, on which is placed the main hope of eradicating Communism, and of making France Christian not only in name but in fact. Father Triron, O.P., points out that Catholic young men, after joining the Royalist movement, "feel a profound contempt for continuous, silent and persevering religious activity."

Yet young men are needed for such activity not only in France and in Europe, but in the United States as well. The call sent out to the youth of France applies to our American Catholic youth as well, and the hope of their answering such a call rests largely on our Catholic colleges.

No apostolate, however, no movement toward the betterment of the social order can succeed without guidance. If this guidance is political, if it is narrow or unenlightened, the noblest work will do more harm than good in

the end. "The directors of the *Action Française*," writes Pope Pius XI to Cardinal Dubois of Paris, "have not shown themselves by their writings to be masters of Christian doctrine and morals; a consideration, it would seem, which should not be forgotten by all those who aspire 'toward a Christian social order'." Hence besides the political and social bearings of these pronouncements, there is also an educational lesson.

The precise point in which the leaders of the Royalist party have laid themselves open to criticism lies in the fact that, as M. Maurras himself acknowledges, the *Action Française* is "a school of politics." "Yet speaking generally no school," to quote the *Osservatore Romano* for October 6, "and in particular no school of political science can abstract for Catholics from the Faith and from Christian morals, especially if this school takes as its program the preparation of a Christian social order." A false ideal, as St. Thomas points out (*Ia IIae, q.19, a. 3, ad 2*), can only result in a false system of concrete action: be that action political, social, or otherwise.

As to the teachers who by word or pen undertake to teach the moral sciences, such as political economy, sociology, the philosophy of history, the science of government, to Catholic youth, they must themselves not only have some familiarity with Catholic teaching, but they must be masters of Catholic philosophy and Catholic ethics, fit, "to submit to strict examination in all matters pertaining to the orthodoxy of their opinions." As for the pupil, he should not content himself with a mere "passive resistance" to such false theoretic teaching. He is obliged in conscience to avoid, to "remove himself as far as possible from" the environment and the personal influence of any teachers of such sciences, as are unfit to be considered as masters of Catholic doctrine.

The bearing of this pronouncement on the question of young men and women attending the lectures of non-Catholic professors on matters of social, political, or economic theory, I leave to my readers to deduce.

The full acceptance of some of these principles, however plain they may seem, is far from easy to those who have been bred, as it were, to the French Royalist program. Hence there is a touch of the martyr's nobility in their unquestioning profession of loyalty to the Holy See.

Speaking on October 18 to the French pilgrims who came for the beatification of the Martyrs of the French Revolution, the Holy Father spoke of this group, for a considerable part themselves Royalists, and deeply affected by the distinctions which they were now called upon to make, as "children of the Martyrs." "One must sometimes have," he said, "something of the spirit of the martyr for that integrity of obedience, which is indispensable to anyone who wishes to remain always, and at every price, a worthy son of God, of the Church, and of our common Faith." Though at present we are not called upon to share in the trials of our brethren of France and Mexico, at least let us share in their loyalty to the See of Peter.

The Magi: "Their Science Their Theology."

F. P. LeBuffe, S.J.

"ITS apparition could not escape the notice of these Oriental sages, who nightly watched the skies; for their science was also their theology" are the words wherewith Father Faber describes how the holy Magi read the call of God in the heavens. Poring every night over that scroll which was written by the hand of the omnipotent God Himself, they had learned to read between the stars, and to detect therein the fingers that guided them and that poised the planets in their restless orbits. The "music of the spheres" for them was the refrain caught up from angelic choirs, of which indeed they knew nothing, and yet were skilled enough to trace the harmony they heard to sources beyond the world of sense and time. "Out beyond the shining of the farthest star, Thou art ever stretching infinitely far" was a thought as familiar to these hoary-headed Orientals as it was when we sang the hymn after Communion.

They were real scholars these men, for they read God's handwriting everywhere in nature. Of their studies and their research it might well be said: "Turn but a stone and start an Angel's wing." If they gazed upon the earth they found there the *vestigia Dei*, the disclosures of God—which make Him real to every man that thinks, and when they gazed heavenwards and peered around the corner of a star they found Him there already. They "knew all the swift importings on the wilful face of skies," and those importings told of God who held them all in check and formed and framed their laws even though they seemed to come and go in lawless-wise. "Their science was also their theology."

Thus it was with the Magi and thus it is with every true scholar. "True science," continues Faber, "has its childlike spirit, its beautiful simplicity. Learning makes children of its professors, when their hearts are humble and their lives are pure." The theologian reads the book of Revelation and grows humble as he reads, if he reads aright, and finds God everywhere. The scientist reads the book of nature and he too finds lowly-mindedness increasingly his companion, for he finds God in the "cyphered chambers of the taciturn rocks"; in the cadences of the waves that billow on, eternally changing, yet eternally the same; in the whirling worlds of the gigantic cosmos and of the tiny, elusive electron; in the body of man and in his soul, too, where their very complexities and intricacies of adjustment bespeak convincingly an intelligence that outstrips the bounds of the finite world.

Yet the sciolists of science declare these days—as did the legislators of France a few decades back—that they have outlawed God from His creation. With the petty insolence of naughty children who scream as they smash beautiful things, these modern iconoclasts cry out wilfully in their glee when they have advanced anew time-worn, oft-refuted proofs, that there is no God—and all the while God smiles as a parent smiles in pity at their witlessness.

Because a Protestant Bishop and some Catholic schol-

ars worked out from the Bible the conclusion that Adam was created some 6006 years B.C. and because now we find that *probably* that is not true, there is a hubbub that therefore the Bible is wrong, hence there is no God.

Because we find that "the earth does move" and that the universe is not geocentric, there is another hue and cry that therefore the Bible is wrong again, for it says the sun stood still; and sound philosophy and theology are also wrong because they tell us that the visible world is anthropocentric, built for man as its visible king, that knowing it and using it aright, he may give God "formal glory" i.e. intelligent and volitional praise and honor as he reads from material visible things the "fundamental glory" of God which is but the mute shadowing forth of His perfections, the beauty of which is caught by finite minds from finite things.

Because there are organs of which we do not yet know the functions, near-scholars would have it that "the design of God" written so largely and intelligently in the body of man is all an outworn myth. Yet might they not conjecture that there might be organs built to function only in embryonic life, or organs which have atrophied because of our unnatural housed-up life, or—last but not least—that maybe they themselves do not "know it all"? A Bantu would not know what a semaphore was doing along the track over which the Twentieth Century Limited roars. But would that Bantu therefore be right in concluding it had no use?

Because no soul has ever settled as a precipitate in a test tube or manifested any specific gravity or shown irritability under an electric current as do dead frogs' legs, we are greeted with the clamor that there is no soul. But if one cannot see the odor of a rose, is there none? Or cannot taste "the wailful sweetness of the violin," is that sweetness therefore a figment of a diseased imagination? As well deny the existence of objects of the sense of smell because we cannot hear them, as deny the existence of spiritual things because we cannot weigh them.

"A little learning is a dangerous thing" was never truer than it is today, dangerous to ourselves and very dangerous to others if we hold positions of authority in pulpit, classroom or lecture-hall. Imagination has usurped the place of reason; freedom of thought has vindicated for all the right to think foolishly and to draw unwarranted conclusions; broadmindedness that should make the mind a respectable home into which any comely guest might be admitted has been made to stand for an open-mindedness that makes the mind a shed wide to the four winds of heaven through which any wanton gust of thought may blow. It were well for all of us to heed Tennyson's advice:

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
And more of reverence in us dwell,
That mind and heart according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster.

We need the lesson of the Magi, need it badly. We must read the book of nature as they did, we must make our science our theology—a treatise that tells us of God.

The Federation of Colored Catholics

J. L. F.

THE Second Annual Meeting, on December 12 and 13, of the Federation of Colored Catholics in Washington, where they again enjoyed the hospitality of Father Olds, the steadfast friend of the colored race and its interests, gave our Catholic Negroes a bright outlook for the New Year. The hope has dawned on them that the difficulties of colored Catholics as a body may be gradually overcome in such a way as to strengthen them in the Faith and its practice.

Owing to the lack of contacts, on the higher plane of religion and charity, between the colored Catholics and their white brethren in religion, few of us realize how weak is their condition as a group despite the strength of individuals in the Faith. As St. Paul said of the early Christians: "There are not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble." Like the early Christians, too, they are immersed for the great part in decidedly demoralizing conditions of life, often in sheer pagan surroundings. The colored youth, or the colored maiden, that would keep a clean heart in the midst of this world, has to face every devastating influence that may confront any white girl or boy, without the social safeguards that do afford the latter some protection. Many have been obliged, willy-nilly, to migrate with the movement of the general Negro crowd, and take jobs that cut them adrift from every vestige of home stability. The decent Catholic colored family is often sunk in a mass that, if not hostile, is at least indifferent to religion.

By a curious irony of fate, in spite of their age as one of the first Catholic groups of our country, and their exclusive use of the English language, they are isolated to a degree from the general Catholic body. Unlike the various foreign-language bodies in this country, they have practically no clergy of their own, and have none of the foreign affiliations, which, while presenting decided difficulties from an American point of view, still assure for many of our national groups a wonderful amount of co-operation and social vigor. Besides being isolated from their racial brethren by their religion, and from their religious brethren by their race, and from the foreign world by their Americanism, they have been until of late largely isolated from one another. The various local groups of colored Catholics are frequently so widely separated, sometimes by half the expanse of the United States, that in their humble condition of life there has been little question of any mutual intercourse, or knowledge even of each other's existence. It was all the more interesting, therefore, when the eighty-one delegates who attended the recent Convention could relate to one another their experiences, again somewhat in the tone of the first Christian groups, that compared notes between Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome.

All however could bear witness to the propaganda and influence of large, highly organized, often richly endowed non-Catholic groups within their own number. The recent dedication of the gorgeous St. Mark's Methodist

Church in Harlem, with its apparatus of social and recreational features, is only one instance of the monopoly held by the different sects of those things which naturally attract the Negro youth of both sexes, particularly those who seek recreations and contacts of a more refined nature.

The Federation of Colored Catholics, under the presidency of Dr. Thomas W. Turner, of Hampton Institute, Virginia, has tried to offset some of these disadvantages by helping to unite our colored Catholics in a simple and practical manner. The union has come naturally, chiefly through the federation of local societies. The aims, as well as the self-imposed limits of the Federation, are set forth in the following words introductory to its Constitution:

It aims to federate all Catholic organizations and individuals of the race into one comprehensive organization, and to focus their attention upon the single purpose of improving the condition of the Catholic Negro temporally and spiritually. While local conditions will not be overlooked, this organization is especially concerned with setting forth the true plight and the urgent needs of the Catholic Negro throughout the country, in order that each community may have an intelligent ideal toward which to work. . . . This organization is not intended to supplant any other existing organization, nor to compete, in any way, with other Church organizations; its sole purpose is to weld all others into a solid unit for racial betterment.

In his address to the delegates Dr. Turner laid especial stress on adherence to a constructive program, along lines pointed out last year by Archbishop Curley, of Baltimore, at the first meeting of the Federation. The same policy was emphasized in his sermon by Father Duckett, of Detroit, the most recent member of the colored race to be raised to the priesthood, who was one of Father Olds' parishioners in his youth.

One of the first tangible results of the Federation has been its venture in Catholic journalism, the *Council Review*, edited at 808 C Street, S. E., Washington, D. C., which serves as the official organ of the Federation, and as a means of instruction as well as of communication between the various colored groups of the United States. The delegates were also urged to bring the power of Catholic opinion to bear on the secular Negro press, in the interests of truth and morals. The words spoken by Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, in his welcome to the Convention on the first day, found, I think, an echo in the hearts of all present:

I know of no group in the Catholic Church who are doing more evangelistic work than the colored folk of the Catholic Church. When I think of the poor colored men and women with all the things attempting to keep them away from the Mother Church, I am touched, and inspired to be a better Catholic myself . . . I want our colored Catholics of America to know that we who are not colored wish every progress for you. You have persevered with altogether too little encouragement and too little welcome.

If the Federation has done no more than to bring to the notice of the general Catholic public the personalities of those colored men and women who have been working with great self-sacrifice for the last two years to bring it into being, its existence would be amply justified.

Sociology**An Archdiocesan Council and the Immigrant**

ANNA McCLURE SHOLL

AMONG the superstitions of optimism is the widely prevalent idea that the United States offers a melting-pot for the foreigner which works on the order of a self-feeder, so that the immigrant automatically fuses with his new country by reason of his residence here.

Only a superficial knowledge of the facts of the case is needed to overthrow this pleasing assumption. One fact is the number of illiterate voters among the foreign-born. A few other facts are the proportion who never take out citizenship papers at all; the percentage who return to their own countries as soon as they have accumulated enough to keep them comfortably in the peasant status of their origin; the percentage of these who, so far from being good citizens swell the ranks of our criminals, and thus add to the problems of the nation. The Catholic Church is addressing herself to this subject through several channels, one of the most important of which is the work done by the National Council of Catholic Women.

The unit of the Archdiocese of New York, as the chief port of the country, must deal with the immigrant, so to speak, at first hand; and it receives him sometimes as the very rawest of raw material. To work this raw material into good American citizenship calls for more than the automatics of Ellis Island, employment agencies, immigrant homes, or such first aids as affect merely the physical well-being of the new arrivals. These are necessary—as necessary and significant as all the primary formalities—but the task of turning the immigrant into a good citizen is a far longer and slower process.

At the annual meeting of the New York Archdiocesan Council of the National Council of Catholic Women held at the Hotel Plaza last month the work done for the immigrant was stressed in several papers read on that occasion. Miss Mabel McClure, the Executive Secretary of the Council in her report stated that between December 1, 1925, and December 1, 1926, we received the names of 3,203 newly-arrived immigrants. During the same period we had under care 2,146 people, who were referred to us previous to December 1, 1925, and our interest was asked by non-sectarian or Catholic agencies in 41 other special cases. This makes a total of 5,390 cases under supervision during the year. These people represent 55 nationalities; the majority are Irish, German, Italian, Slavic and Spanish-speaking persons. This necessitates having field workers who can speak all these languages. We have prepared letters in Polish, Spanish, Italian and French which are left with the people visited. These letters give the address of the nearest Catholic Church where confessions can be heard in their native tongue; the location of the school is given in which they may learn English. They are also reminded, if they intend to become citizens, to come to our office at 641 Lexington Avenue, where the citizenship procedure will be explained to them and where they will

be helped to fill out their first or second citizenship papers.

We have kept in close touch with the National Catholic Welfare Conference at the Port of New York and at Washington and depend upon them for assistance when we have requests for extension of tourist visas, securing or cancellation of bonds, application for preference quota, or non-visas, issue of visas for returning aliens, etc.

The Council also keeps watch, on bills introduced into Congress which affect immigration and these bills are presented to the various groups to make them "aware of the perils to the democratic institution of our country, due to the widespread propaganda of a fear and hatred of the foreign-born."

Miss McClure here touched upon one of the most vital and significant of national problems in its relation to the immigrant; and through him—when he is of the Catholic Faith—to the Church. For side by side with the superstition of the automatic melting-pot could appropriately be placed the paradoxical superstition which clamors for the survival and pre-eminence of the Nordic race and sees in the Latin a menace to the democratic principles of the United States; chiefly it would seem because the Latins are Catholic by tradition.

This arrant nonsense is widely accepted by many who are ignorant of history and take their ideas on most matters beyond the shops of Main Street from the bigoted over-lords of local public opinion. They know nothing of the genius of the Latin race, flowering again and again from Dante to Galvani in every art and science; and as to the Italian who keeps the corner fruit-stand, and who may be a Chesterfield in courtesy contrasted with them, of him they are only conscious that he needs to wash his face.

The Italian immigrant, it must be admitted, is perhaps not always best fitted to interpret the Church correctly to the American public, inclined to be mistrustful of what it does not understand. His exuberant Latin temperament, his love of bright color and display can be seen in any *festa* in lower New York, confusing the Puritan whose taste in religion runs to Vandyke-brown, or the cold Chinese-white of some frozen meeting-house amid the snows of Massachusetts. The Puritan as a type wishes to impose his religious will on others and he is the menace to democratic America rather than the care-free Italian, who will devoutly wreath his statue of St. Rita with brightly colored paper-flowers without a glance over his shoulder to see if anybody is approving or disapproving. The idea of an Italian being interested enough in Protestantism to seek to overthrow it is amusing. Call it a pagan or a Christian quality, but his *insouciance* is one source of his perpetual charm. Charming citizens are as much needed as meticulous ones. And he is after all only one of many, including the famous Nordics, who, strange as it may seem, are not always Protestants.

The topography of New York, unique among cities, holds its heterogeneous population in close confinement by natural barriers, creating problems which, at times, seem insoluble. Into this whirlpool between canyons the immi-

grant is cast to sink or swim, survive or perish, according to his endowment, or the strength of his intentions. Even in the most hopeful cases many obstacles loom between him and the realization of his ambitions. Perhaps for days, weeks, months, the mystifications of this time of readjustment go on; and in his efforts to get both feet safely on the new ledge the Catholic immigrant may well forget all worlds but that of the tenement street, raucous with the shouts of children and of the push-cart men. Joined to this importunate clamor of the arriving, is his own cry for knowledge, for freedom, for what might be called the Golden Legend of the New World, the reports of whose unbounded opportunities had first reached him in far-away Serbia or Austria.

That golden legend might draw him from all but earthly cares and the Church herself become a legend forgotten, if he were left to wander alone among these confusions of novelty. But the Church reinforces him in two directions, that of his earthly and that of his heavenly citizenship. No other religious body has prepared so valuable an aid to American citizenship as the "Civics Catechism," printed in several languages, including Slovak, Arabic, Croatian, Portuguese, Lithuanian and others. This little book, issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, is of such worth that other bodies non-sectarian in character have sought permission to use it. The immigrant is very literally "followed up," after this civic introduction to the United States by those who point the way to his new parish home and see to the care of his children.

The care of the immigrant's child is perhaps the most important of all the works undertaken by the Archdiocesan Council. The habits of the adult immigrant are more difficult to adjust to his new character of American citizen, but his child is as clay in the hands of the potter. Mrs. Michael Gavin, the President of the Archdiocesan Council, in her report at the Third Annual Meeting gave the following statistics: "The Committee on Religious Instruction started a course on the teaching of catechetical instruction to public-school children at the Convent of the Cenacle on February 11, 1926, where 227 persons volunteered to take the course given by a Religious of the Cenacle. The course was finished April 24 and classes at the following centers were conducted from then to the close of the school year and were reopened in October: Monday, St. Anne, East Harlem, 175 to 200 children. Tuesday, St. Lucy's, 175 to 200 children. Wednesday, Our Lady of Carmel, 175 to 200 children. Thursday, St. Anne, 300 girls.

"We had four active centers with a hundred volunteers teaching, and each week they reached between 825 and 875 children."

What the reaction of such teaching on the home of the immigrant means is obvious. It can be summed up in the words of His Eminence Cardinal Hayes in his address at the meeting "Every act you do, every word you utter, will bring a benediction to New York City" and, we may add, to the entire country.

Education

The Klan at Harvard

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THIS pamphlet's cover of flaming scarlet makes one think of Bebel or that famous Boston ordinance which forbade, it is said, the flaunting of red flags in public processions. The author is Floyd S. Gove, professor of education at Drake University, and his subject is "Religious Education in Public School Time." As an examination of a question that receives the attention of educators and publicists throughout the country, this study published as a Bulletin of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, is almost worthless. In its statistics it leaves much to be desired, but more serious faults are Dr. Gove's failure to understand points of view which are not his own, his weakness in evaluating authorities, and an evident bias against the position in education of the Catholic Church. A deplorable diatribe published more than twenty years ago by a thoroughly discredited ex-priest is cited on the same page with such works as Coe's "Social Theory of Religious Education" and Cubberley's "Public Education in the United States." Even when Dr. Gove quotes a Catholic authority *verbatim* he seems to miss the point with a regularity that is almost suspicious. Not infrequently his "criticism" might more properly be termed a sneer. Thus on p. 81 he quotes from Father Dunne's excellent book "The Parish School":

We have the Church, the great teacher of the world, as our prototype, and to some extent a certain unconscious imitation of her finds its way into the mind and heart of the Catholic teacher, so that, though often out of poorer material, we can produce teachers *who excel in personal hold over children and influence for good by their great affection and the value they set on souls.* (Italics inserted.)

Incredible as it may seem, Dr. Gove offers the following comment:

Father Dunne, in his book, "The Parish School," makes several references to some mystical power which he claims comes to the aid of Catholic teachers, *making them better purveyors of mathematical and historical* as well as of more strictly religious truth. (Italics inserted.)

The contrast is a fair illustration of Dr. Gove's critical powers. Father Dunne writes that the Catholic teacher by making his own the Church's love of souls can gain a hold on the child and influence him for good, even in spite of inferior mental gifts. Dr. Gove gravely asserts that, in Father Dunne's opinion, there is a mystical power in the Catholic Church which makes Catholic teachers "better purveyors of mathematical and historical . . . truth."

In treating of the purposes of the Catholic school, Dr. Gove has recourse to the familiar—and discredited—method of suggesting that this or that is true, without troubling himself about the facts. After asserting boldly that "from the standpoint of social welfare" the Catholic parish schools "are open to criticism," he thus marshals the "argument": "Whether such schools are un-American in aim and present practice is often debated."

I suppose it is possible to debate whether or not Chief Justice Taft is un-American, but the fact of his patriotism would not be affected by the fact that it was debated. Nor would any man who knows the Chief Justice's long and honorable career be slow to range himself with the negative. The same test should be applied to the Catholic schools. To suggest what one does not dare assert and prove is neither scholarly nor straightforward. Dr. Gove continues:

It cannot be denied that it would be easily possible for the church to condition the child's environment and limit knowledge to its own selfish aims.

Nor can it be denied that it would be easily possible for the present Secretary of the Treasury to manipulate the stock-market for his private gain, or easily possible for the President of the United States to use the weight of his great influence to crush some struggling departmental clerk. The question is—if there be a question—whether there is reason to fear that these officials will act in a dishonorable manner.

And whatever the aim, it is true that the segregation of children in parochial schools tends to limit the basis of common knowledge and common experience, both of which are essential to a common understanding of civic relationships.

Wisely does Dr. Gove decline to search for evidence: he might as well look for a pot of gold at the rainbow's end. While I confess that I do not know of any "common knowledge" or "common experience" essential to "a common understanding of civic relationships" which the Catholic school withholds from its pupils, I also confess that Dr. Gove is not answerable for my ignorance. But his reluctance to enlighten us, forces us to grope as best we may along the road of assumption.

Perhaps we may pass over the circumstance that the late Theodore Roosevelt was but one of many who despite a training in private schools, contrived to reach a fairly decent understanding of civic relationships. I assume, however, that in Dr. Gove's belief the necessary tendency of the Catholic school is to make bad or indifferent citizens. At once we are struck with the singular phenomena presented by such citizens as the late Chief Justice White and Cardinal Mercier; and while it may be invidious to speak of the living, he would be a bold man to declare that Governor Smith of New York had his understanding of "civic relationships" darkened by his apprenticeship in the old parish school of St. James.

It is open to Dr. Gove to retort that these men are the exception. My retort is that scholarship bases criticism upon evidence. Sneers and insinuations against the Catholic school are not evidence.

The strongest prop of government as well as the most secure guarantee of good citizenship is religion and a moral code based upon religion, as Washington has declared. Now the parish school believes that if it strives to make its pupils good Christians, the country need not fear that in maturity they will be recreant to their duties as citizens. In that faith has it labored, and not in vain. It can proudly call its roster of men and women, of whom some have laid down their lives for their country,

while others strive to fulfill in high station or in low, their duties to God, their fellows and themselves. And what is that "understanding of civic relationships" which, logically, would close every private school in this country, and by forcing the children into State-controlled institutions destroy a right which the Supreme Court has twice decided to be a right guaranteed by the Federal Constitution?

But Dr. Gove scales yet loftier heights of absurdity.

Catholic leaders have been quick to see that the strength of the Catholic Church as an institution lies in the conditioning of the individual's attitudes and ideals through the parochial schools. *They realize that the whole of truth in the realm of mathematics or science must inevitably conflict with the traditional conceptions of religious truths, and they are apparently willing to continue to build the structure of ecclesiasticism on the perilous foundations of half-truths, rather than risk temporary confusion and decline through a revaluation of aims.* (Italics inserted.)

I am not a leader myself, but I have known very many of the leaders in Catholic education for some years. Possibly my acquaintance with them is not so intimate as that possessed by Dr. Gove; this limitation may account for my reluctance to believe them a group of consciously dishonest rascals. It has always seemed to me that they apprehended no conflict whatever between "the whole of truth in the realm of mathematics or science" and their belief as Catholics; although, like Newton and Pasteur, and unlike Dr. Gove, they would readily have confessed that they were ignorant of "the whole of truth" in those realms. But the thought need not be pursued: Dr. Gove's accusation of conscious dishonesty is too grotesque to merit serious consideration.

A more unscholarly piece of work than Dr. Gove's pamphlet was never given the imprint of a graduate school. It has significance only to the extent that it represents the survival of a crude and narrow philosophy chiefly confined in these days to the Ku Klux Klan and similar anti-social groups.

TWELVE O'CLOCK

At midnight in the hospital
A little nun in white
Came tip-toe down the corridor
Bearing a candle-light.

At twelve o'clock with noiseless step
She passed from bed to bed,
And held a light at each man's face
For fear he might be dead.

And some men sighed, and some men moaned,
And some began to pray,
To show the little nun in white
They had not passed away.

But there were some who made no moan
Although they did survive;
And there was one who thought he died
And dreamt he was alive,—

Who thought he died and dreamt he saw
A little nun in white
Come tip-toe in at twelve o'clock,
Bearing a candle-light.

LEONARD FEENEY, S. J.

With Scrip and Staff

WHAT can we expect of a baby year? What can we expect of babies anyhow? Yet the great world, groaning under Adam's burden, looked for redemption from a Child. The past year, which in its hot prime of August honored a young man with a child's heart, St. Francis of Assisi, in its last gasp of decrepitude, on December 31, glorified the Bicentenary of the canonization of two youths, Aloysius and Stanislaus. It is the day for enrolling youth in the moral warfare, as eight years ago it was the time for enrolling them in physical warfare. Mussolini is polishing up new rules for his Balilla, whatever that is, and even so conservative a person as Mr. Rouser remarks that the young ones are aiming to take charge anyhow, so they might as well have some sense put into them before they get into politics. Father Hennrich, O.M. Cap., believes that the American boy warms up easily to the ideal of St. Francis. He ought to be a good judge, since as Chief Commissioner, he has made a marked success of the Catholic Boy's Brigade of the United States. To prove his point, he has spread to this country the Seraphic Tertiary Youth Movement, whereby the glorious ideals and graces of the Third Order of St. Francis are made attractive and available for boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one. Father Hennrich has a sane optimism that will accomplish great things, and believes that any difference that may be found between the youth of our land and those of other countries, will be found to the favor of our own boys and girls. For a description of his work and the manner of organization, write to the Third Order Bureau, 1740 Mount Elliott Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.

ON the apostolic spirit among our young men depends all the future of the Church, but particularly of our vocations to the priesthood and the missionary life. We forget sometimes that the need for priests in the foreign missions is endless: half a million, writes a missionary, could be placed in India alone. Our own Philippines, humanly speaking, will never be supplied. Father Coenen, a Dutch missionary in Central Africa, writes that there are only two priests in his locality, on the Congo, to look after 400,000 souls, with 137 mission stations.

SO too our own country is short by thousands of the priests that we need, priests especially to go out to the open country or to the big industrial centers, and share the farmer's johnnycake or the laborer's molasses. Why then should we pass over the older men, when some mere accident of fortune has closed the door of the Seminary to them in younger years? True, it is harder to shut out the world and its easy ways at thirty-five than at twenty. Still, Father Jeremiah P. O'Mahoney, of the Syracuse House of Studies, at Oriskany, New York, like Father Lester, S.J., of Osterley in England, is willing to

try his luck with the man who has a "belated vocation," and see what can be done for him at the "Eleventh Hour," as he calls his little publication in their behalf. Father O'Mahoney has the blessing on his work of Pope Pius XI, and the enthusiastic cooperation of Bishop Curley of Syracuse. His young men, some of them recent professional men, engineers and of course war-veterans, are dead in earnest. The school is exclusively for men past twenty-one years of age. After completing their full classical course, the men will be placed at the call of our Bishops and the superiors of Religious Communities. Father O'Mahoney is not planning for any makeshifts or stop-gaps. He is trying for the highest type of scholarship and spirituality. Since he is inaugurating a great and new work in this country, we wish him every possible success.

IF there will be anything new in the New Year, it will probably be to show us that there is no class of people, young or old, who are not attracted by high ideals of Christian self-sacrifice once their characteristics as a group are reckoned with. As Father Hennrich with his young Tertiaries, or Father O'Mahoney with his ex-doughboys and doctors, so Father Thuente, O.P., by his work of organization and retreats, has turned the lowly drudgery of the priest's housekeeper into the fulfilment of a lofty religious vocation. It is like a recognition of his peculiar insight that he should be now given one of the highest distinctions in the Order of Friars Preachers, that of Preacher General. Father Thuente and Mgr. Reverman, recently elevated to the See of Superior, Wisconsin, are both alumni of the Seminary of Innsbruck, which, incidentally, has always taken a peculiar interest in the priestly vocations of men handicapped by late beginnings or difficult circumstances.

IN view of all the difficulties a young man experiences in the pursuit of a higher vocation, it is interesting to find how profitable can be the careers of those Red gentlemen who claim to be the saviors of the clergy-ridden proletariat from the jaws of starvation. M. Leonid Krasin, the recent Soviet Ambassador in London, seems to have turned the process of destroying capitalism to quite a neat profit. Like some others of the Red variety, who are nearer neighbors to our borders, he had the forethought to put away his treasure in a country where it would be safe from his own brethren. The prophet of the proletariat is said to have left in the Paris banks, for his two daughters to inherit, some 10,000,000 francs, about \$300,000. A man surely deserves some recompense for the misery of being bossed by the TZIP and the Komintern. Nevertheless, one does get a little dizzy trying to figure out just where the capitalist ends and the Communist begins.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature**The Magi Arrive**

FRANCIS TALBOT, S.J.

POETS and painters present us with far more details of the Magi and their adoration than do the historians and scripturists. While the artists have illuminated the gospel story with glowing colors and palpitating atmosphere, the scholars have frowned and scowled at all the legends and myths that have grown up about the visit of the Wise Men. They say that the kings were not kings, but just astrologers who belonged to the sacred caste of the Medes. These kings who were not kings were not three in number. The more or less than three who were not kings were not named Gaspar, Melchior and Balthasar. These reputed personages did not see a star nor a comet, at least not the kind of stars with which we are familiar; they saw only a light that resembled a star. The unnumbered, unnamed men who were not kings did not find Mary and the Child in the stable, for the Holy Family had gone off to Jerusalem and then to Nazareth and were now safely returned to a comfortable cottage in Bethlehem. They did not arrive in time for the first Christmas celebration; as a matter of calculation they were twelve days late for the second feast.

These scholars are a sour and hard-headed lot. They do not indulge in the ecstasy and the exuberance that the poets and the painters feel over the coming of the Three Kings. The historians are doubtless correct in their facts, but the poets are more truthful in their spirit. With one part of me I must agree with the scholars, but the greater part of me is well content to be misinformed by the poets and the painters. Let the scholars hold to their negations, but—I speak for most Catholics—let the artists run fancy free with their dreams and their visions. Let the former tell me what did not or could not happen, but let the latter show me what might have happened, and I humanly rejoice in the falsehoods.

For example, I like to look on the six-pointed star sending its conical rays full on the face of three kings, one of them black, as painted by Jean Portaels, even though I know that the star did not have six points. Ghirlandajo, I realize, is not true to facts when he shows a gorgeous cavalcade of silken-clad lords, seated on richly-caparisoned steeds and attended by innumerable servitors, as it streams along the ledge of a precipitous mountain side and nears the Infant who rests under a shed supported by marble Corinthian pillars. Dürer places the Adoration scene on a humble front-porch, with a scissored star showing through the rafters and with the Infant plunging his little Hand into the casket which the kneeling king is presenting to Him. Dürer may be woefully wrong in all his facts, more wrong than Velasquez in his shaded and more stately portrait, or he may be nearer to the truth than Rubens who masses the kings and slaves together into a closely packed group before the glowing Babe, or than Lippi who carefully poses the kings and their followers on either

side of the Holy Family and centers a white, round star over the head of the Child. But the vagrant fancies of the painters are pleasant to look upon and satisfying to the spirit; so what matters it that they are not scientifically accurate.

My curiosity to know what Mary said to the Magi and what they said to the Child comes with each Christmas season. It has been satisfied now, since I chanced to read St. Ephraem's record of it. The Syrian poet, who lived only about three and one half centuries after the event, is so explicit in the details of this conversation that he must actually have overheard every word of it. The Persian princes, he narrates, "found the Child lying in the house of a poor maid: but falling down they adored Him with much joy and offered Him their treasures." Then Mary spoke to them; I was somewhat surprised to learn that she could be so sceptical and rationalistic; but she was probably merely testing their faith. She asked the kings very bluntly:

"To whom offer ye these things? and why offer ye them? what has brought ye from your country, to come to my Child with your treasures?"

With all the faith of true believers, with all the patience of the teachers that they were, with all the subtle flattery of Oriental diplomats, the kings answered:

"Thy Child is King, and all diadems are made by Him, for he is the King of all kings, and His kingdom is above this world, and all things are subject to His dominion."

Mary was not convinced by this answer, for St. Ephraem reports that she continued her questionings. "I am needy and poor," she said; "could I have brought forth a King?" "Thou alone hast had this happiness, to give birth to the great King. Poverty shall now be honored on thy account," they assured her.

She pointed out to them: "My house is little and poor, and empty is this my dwelling. . . . This Babe is the Child of a poor maid, who would not be allowed even to look at a king. . . . This Babe is speechless: He is but a tiny Babe, as you see, he has neither crown nor throne. He has no troops or legions, or armies, but lies couched as best His Mother's poverty can provide: how, then, call you him King?"

The "kingly sophies" were undaunted by Our Lady's questions. They answered her most magnificently: "The armies of thy Child are there above, they ride on the clouds of heaven, and light up the firmament with their brightness, and one of their number came down to call us, and all our people were in consternation."

This transcript of the conversation, I take it, is more or less correct. In truth, however, it must be added that there are certain discrepancies between it and some medieval accounts, and that it is wholly denied by eminent research-workers. Nevertheless, it is really remarkable what information the poets and painters have collected. They tell us far more interesting things than scholars and students.

They throw a great number of lurid sidelights on the other king who was not so wise. A medieval poet, whose

authority is above reproach, is my authority for stating that the three kings

As they came forth with their offering
They met with Herod that moody king.

They went their homeward way unaware of the tragedy that that interview begot. He attests that

When they came home to their countrie
Glad and blithe they were all three
Of the sight that they had see
By dene-a
The company was clene-a.

But the moody king had dark designs. Crashaw argued with Herod and told him "Look to thy reason, man, and mock thy doubts." Wisely does he debate the matter:

Thou art a soldier, Herod; send thy scouts,
See how he's furnished for so feared a war.
What armour does he wear? a few thin clouts.
His trumpets? tender cries. His men, to dare
So much? rude shepherds. What his steeds? alas,
Poor beasts! a slow ox and a simple ass.

Crashaw cannot deter Herod; and so Fletcher must lament

And yet but newly he was infanted
And yet already he was sought to die.

and Mary must croon, as the Coventry Miracle Play asserts,

Herod the king, in his raging,
Charged he hath this day
His men of might in his own sight
All young children to slay.

That woe is me, poor child for thee!
And ever mourne, and may
For thy parting neither say nor sing
By, by, lully lullay.

Theologians are discreetly silent about what these tender babies, whom Herod martyred, said and looked like. For this information, we have to consult with the poets and painters. A very good account is given by Housman:

It was in fair Bethlehem,
That night the children died:
They came to play where Jesus lay,
And Mary's arms were wide.
"Oh, open, open!" cried they then,
"As wide as wide can be!
Heart of childhood suffer us
To come to thee!"

And if anyone cares to know just precisely what the children looked like, he may find their pictures in Ruben's painting. A veritable flock of them surround Mary and her Child. They sit on the clouds and look down on their little Brother, they clutch ecstatically at Mary's dress, they tumble about upside and down. They are all gurgling and happy, even the one tiny urchin that gazes down on the earth in amazement.

There were 14,000 of these baby saints, unbaptized by water, says the Greek liturgy. There were 64,000, corrects the Syrian version. There were precisely 140,000, computes the medieval writer. But no; the dry-as-fact modern investigator stifles our enthusiasm again by asserting that there could not have been more than fifteen two-year-olds in Bethlehem at the time, and that probably only six mothers were bereaved. I suppose these moderns would

even deny that the bodies of these babies are preserved at St. Pauls Outside the Walls, or at the Cathedrals in Padua, Lisbon, Milan and other places. They may even doubt that the marvelous shrine in the Cologne Cathedral really encloses the bones of the Three Kings. But we must not be too severe in our blame of the scholars; we should rather pity them for their scepticism about all the charming and delightful, even though slightly exaggerated, information that the poets and painters invent.

REVIEWS

Darwin. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company. \$3.50.

Mr. Bradford gives us a life of Darwin according to the new method called psychography. As in the old Greek plays perfectly familiar history was a substratum only and character the chief aim, so in psychography the prime object is not new facts culled from unknown records, but soul-scrutiny. It is not a panorama, it is a portrait. To ascribe from this work, the charge of defective biography to the method, might be unfair. Nevertheless you leave "Darwin" wondering, despite repeated quotations and citations, just why the scientist is termed great. To trace this defect to the psychographer's pen yields no satisfaction, for Mr. Bradford writes with a richness of style that stimulates interest and thought. He is for the most part objective. For him Darwin stands out as human, kindly, a keen observer, indomitable in his passion for work. But in a sense Darwin is a victim of Science. Thus this book contains the materials for a tragedy of the old type. Had Darwin's achievements more engaged Mr. Bradford's skill something of the stature he desired in his subject might have appeared. The most powerful chapter deals with the moral and religious havoc effected by Darwin's theory of Evolution. It will prove an arsenal for Anti-Darwinians. At the same time it is apt to plunge the reader into doubts and misgivings from which he can salvage little or none of his faith. Unhappily, here Mr. Bradford indulges in the usual cant of modernists when they conjure up the ghosts of "theologians" and "the Church." "Ghosts" first because "ex hypothesi" they are back-numbers, and secondly because in such authors' minds they abound in filmy haze. One gathers from this and similar froth that humanity has survived the dark centuries of ecclesiastical hobnobbing with tyranny. The modernistic palinody is always modest. God, Heaven and Hell—marionettes that satisfied the puerilities of the past—have been returned to Pandora's box and the whole removed to the attic of history. Instead we have the game of "hide and seek" with science. Through "the mist of years and tears" the modern gropes in vain for a gleam beyond the grave. The millenium turns out an anti-climax.

R. McW.

Heroes of the Air. By CHELSEA FRASER. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

About the time when Shelley was tingling with the thought that he would like to be a dead leaf and go riding madly on the wild west wind, an Italian philosopher was playing with soap-bubbles. This set a couple of Frenchmen to playing with paper-bags. And now, in this twentieth century men do go riding madly on the wild west wind. This sounds rather balmy. Shelley is mentioned only because his thought was a prophecy. The Italian's soap-bubbles contained hydrogen-gas and they rose in the air without bursting as ordinary soap-bubbles do. The Frenchmen's paper-bags were an attempt to find a larger spherical casing that could be raised by a larger quantity of hydrogen-gas. These were the modest beginnings of that science that culminated in the glorious deeds of Alcock, Brown, Macready, Kelly, Maughan, Byrd, Nobile, and a host of others. The author has described briefly the development of flying with just enough scientific information to give a deeper appreciation of the obstacles that were overcome. But his emphasis is

on the exploits of those whose thrilling flights during the last decade have been periodically crowding all other news from the front pages of the newspapers. He has attempted no literary embellishment, but for the most part has let the air-men speak for themselves. And they spin a yarn that outdoes the Magic Carpet of the Arabian Nights or the flight of Daedalus and Icarus in the old mythology. More than once, as he flew over the Atlantic or through dangerous passages of the Rockies or over the frozen wastes of unexplored northlands with the heroes of this book, the reviewer finished a paragraph to find himself tense and breathless with excitement. Read the book, you who can still enjoy a vicarious thrill.

J. A. L.

Murder for Profit. By WILLIAM BOLITHO. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.50.

Scoundrels come and scoundrels go, and it were best for the welfare of the world to let their bones rest undisturbed in their graves. But, every new moon, some clever writer like William Bolitho will go spading in Potter's Field. It is the fad now-a-days for some reading folk to be fascinated by this sort of thing, and to coax a thrill from the horrible history of buried human monsters. In "Murder for Profit" the reader gets his money's worth of horror. For a goodly price he has the privilege of associating with such perverse scoundrels and schizophrenes as William Burke, Jean-Baptiste Toppman, George Smith, Desiré Sandru, and Fritz Haartmann, villains all, who nonchalantly murdered a hundred victims, more or less. The disedifying and nauseating biographies of this galaxy of demoniacs have been variously served up before; but never with the same psychological insight and sympathy as characterize Bolitho's newest chronicle. This gruesome book makes no contribution to the science of criminology, though Bolitho tries to establish the point that these hideous fellows are very like ourselves. The book is hardly more than a sop to satiate one's morbid craving for the macabre. Bolitho does his task well. But the pity is that these several insane savages, Burke and Company, are not permitted to sleep in their graves unremembered and unsung.

J. J. A.

Faith and the Act of Faith. By J. V. BAINVEL, S.J. Translated from the Third French Edition by LEO C. STERCK. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company. \$1.50.

Since Kant's time thoughtful men have been instituting the criticism of their own reason and ideas, and though many fail in their attempt still the attempts are interesting. Not the least provocative question that has occupied modern attention is the precise meaning to be attached to the words "I believe." The true nature and correct notion of Faith and its psychological mechanism have interest as well for non-believers as for believers. The latter must be able to account for the Faith that is in them: the former, tired of scepticism and hungry for a truth that transcends the mere statements of science, are fascinated by it. "Faith and the Act of Faith" is a popular presentation of an intricate problem. The book is not polemical; it is merely a statement of what is to be held as the teaching of the Church on the subject and an attempt to differentiate this from pure theological speculation. The author essays to give a theological theory of Faith. This theory is not a Catholic dogma but only the writer's effort to explain what we know from dogma and to acquire a more exact, profound and scientific idea of Faith. That he has adversaries on particular phases of the analysis of the act of Faith which is in dispute among the schoolmen, does not detract from the value of the work. As these are sufficiently indicated the reader will not be misled. Because Père Bainvel maintains the possibility of natural credibility and the possible distinction between the judgment of faith and the judgment of credibility, he treats the questions of credibility and Faith separately and insists on the objective value of rational credibility. The theory of Faith that pervades the volume rests substantially on the distinction between faith of

science and faith of authority or Christian faith, a distinction borrowed from Cardinal Billot. Four valuable appendices will serve those anxious and qualified to examine more thoroughly than the average reader some of the disputed points discussed in the body of the book.

W. I. L.

Opinions of a Cheerful Yankee. By IRVING BACHELLER. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. \$2.50.

As a novelist, with "Eben Holden" and "Keeping Up with Lizzie," Mr. Bacheller has achieved more than passing fame; but in this collection of observations on life and manners he has presented us with a wooden nutmeg. The Yankee element is more in evidence than the advertised cheerfulness, and the opinions are for the most part platitudes platitudinously expressed. It is as though the little boys and girls at a Sunday school picnic were being warned about the dangers of going in swimming by a ministerial gentleman with a tired voice and the intellectual background of Dr. Frank Crane. Mr. Bacheller reminds us of a commencement orator with a vocabulary and nothing to say. He is prolific in the prosy teachings of a spineless Christianity; he tells of a trip to the Holy Land and revels in trivialities and unessentials; he observes a little sadly the goings on of the younger set, and says, "Well, well," and occasionally "Tut tut!" The book is obviously an effort at "popular" lay preaching, and we do not expect it to sparkle with quotations and bristle with foot notes; but we might not unreasonably look for some indications of wide reading and a cultural background. If so, we look in vain. Mr. Bacheller does not even quote Emerson. Professional novelists sometimes write books of personal opinion on life and art, and usually do it rather well. Often such volumes make stimulating reading. Last year, for instance, Mr. W. B. Maxwell, with his little book called "Life," gave us something to think about and something to argue with and something heartily to applaud. Mr. Bacheller has succeeded merely in being graceful and commonplace and dull.

B. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Pamphlet Publications.—Under the caption "Thoughts for New Year," the *Catholic Mind* for January 8 publishes three articles by the late Timothy Brosnahan, S.J. There is much in these papers by this distinguished scholar that merits prayerful meditation at this time of the year, and this issue of the *Catholic Mind* should find a prominent place in the Church Book-rack. —A separate brochure has been made of the notable article, "A Short History of the Catholic Sisterhoods in the Spanish-American War," which George Barton contributed to the June issue of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. Mr. Barton's historical research is well appreciated by scholars, and this popular account of the way our Sisters, during the Spanish-American War, carried on the work of humanity begun in the Civil War should have an extensive reading. —The first of the projected series of Benedictine Historical Monographs issued from St. Anselm's Priory, Washington, D.C., is by Summerfield Baldwin and is concerned with "The Catholic Negotiations of 1717-1719" in England. The second monograph, promised for immediate publication, is a study of certain accusations against St. Boniface, by Father Betten, S.J. Both booklets may be ordered at \$1.00 each from the Priory at Washington. —"On the Ways of God" (Benziger. 35c.) is a translation from the treatise *De Moribus Divinis* attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas. The version has been competently made by Bernard Delany, O.P.

Aspects of Government.—"To present the modern state as a product of social evolution; to explain how it acquires specific functions and specific means of service, relinquishing certain claims and vindicating others; to show how through all the struggles and disturbances which have raged around its prize of

power, it has established its foundations more broad and more secure" is the scope of "The Modern State" (Oxford University Press: American Branch), by R. M. MacIver. Defining the State as "an association which, acting through law as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order," Professor MacIver treats in four successive sections the emergence of the State, its powers and functions, its forms and institutions and the evolution of modern theories concerning it. Students familiar with the teachings of scholasticism on the State will observe the author's failure to comprehend the right relations of Church and State.

A dozen chapters indicting modern tendencies in democracy and especially coercion through legislation, often espoused by denominational bodies, make up "The Commandments of Men" (Oxford University Press: American Branch. \$1.75), by William Henry Moore. While exception may be taken on religious or philosophical grounds to many of the author's statements, on the other hand an important problem is treated in a provocative way and there is sane thought in much that is stated.

Aspects of Education.—The brief but breezy editorials from the *Sower*, which their author, F. H. Drinkwater, has reprinted in a single volume under the title of the initial paper, "The Givers" (Benziger. \$2.00), have for the most part a relation to the Catholic education of the young. In his ideas the writer is wholly modern and progressive, in his spirit thoroughly Catholic. Even those who may not agree with some of his pedagogical theories will find much that is stimulating and provocative in the essays, especially if their work be in the educational field. Written chiefly to meet British school conditions, Father Drinkwater's discussion of religion in the schools, and cognate topics deserves careful reading on this side of the Atlantic. The final essays are aimed at meeting some of the multitudinous errors of Mr. Wells' "Outline of History."

Pressure upon Congress for the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a Federal department of education, still continues. Because the problem consequently remains a live one, Julia E. Johnsen has compiled and briefed its pros and cons for the use of lecturers, debaters, et al. "The Federal Department of Education" (90c.), constitutes No. 5, Vol. IV, of "The Reference Shelf" (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company). It is supplementary to an earlier number in Vol. 1, dealing specifically with the Towner-Sterling bill. As part of the material included in the "General Discussion" is Dr. James H. Ryan's "New Educational Bill," originally printed in the *Catholic Educational Review*, and as part of the "Negative Discussion," the arguments against the Curtis-Reed bill as presented by Jones I. Corrigan, S.J., of Boston College, at the Congressional Committee hearing last February. The bibliography carries references to at least twenty articles in AMERICA.

The history, principles and applications of mental tests are elaborately and scientifically examined and illustrated by Frank H. Freeman in "Mental Tests" (Houghton, Mifflin). Students of Education and teachers may not accept all of Dr. Freeman's theories and may question some of his findings but they will find his volume informative. Needless to say the author's treatment of the nature of intelligence is wholly from the viewpoint of the modern materialistic and evolutionary psychologists with their consequent deficiencies and shortcomings.

Beautiful and plentiful illustrations and an absence of those understatements and misrepresentations about the position of the Catholics and the Catholic Church in the story of the United States which so often creep into our national histories, make "American History" (Allyn and Bacon. \$1.80), by Clarence Manion, a reliable as well as an entertaining text. This being the third United States' history from a Catholic pen within the past year, no reason remains any longer for the use of questionable historical texts in our schools.

Revelry. Cherry Square. Lady Agatha. Folly's Gold. Mezzanine.

Concurrent with the interest aroused by the story of Washington politics as told in "Revelry" (Boni and Liveright. \$2.00), by Samuel Hopkins Adams, is curiosity as to the precise motive which impelled the author to publish the book. It could well be that the volume is just another instance of the intrigues that are carried on by the characters of the story. The substance of the narrative is an expose, reputed to be basically correct, of the conditions existing in governmental circles when the so-called Willis Markham was President. The author leaves not the slightest doubt as to what Markham's real name was; nor does he make any effort to conceal the identity of the members of the Cabinet and the chief non-official principals of the action. It is a narrative of graft and financial corruption, of the wheels within wheels in the government machinery, of unscrupulous robbery, bribery and murder, of raw intrigue and crude diplomacy. Even though the revelations be only partly true, they are sufficient to destroy faith in the possibility of a clean American government. The personal honesty of the President is insisted upon. He was fanatically loyal to his friends, but his friends were his worst enemies.

There are good people in the world, people with kind hearts and chaste souls, with sunny dispositions and strong character. Most of those who write novels seem never to have associated with such people. But Grace S. Richmond knows of such a group and tells of them in "Cherry Square" (Doubleday, Page. \$2.00). Dr. Schuyler Wendell Chase, the cultured pastor of a fashionable New York church learns heroism through affliction; his wife is as attractive as she is brave. Jenny, the college graduate who became such a "fascinating servant," sanely falls in love with the Scotch preacher and idealist, Mackay, and Norah O'Grady, Irish and Catholic, has a heart of true gold. This story of ministerial life is principally for Protestant readers, but it may be enjoyed by Catholics also.

Romance is written large over "Lady Agatha" (Longmans, Green. \$1.00), by Beatrice Chase, and it is precisely that style of romance which makes the world grow younger. Lady Agatha, a dear, wise, unmarried diplomat arranges a plot to make two young people fall in love. They were bound to each other by a will, but the provisions were such as to drive them away from each other. Despite the will, and contrary to the will they decide on marriage; and then, to their surprise, they discover that they are deciding according to the will. The narrative is written in a dainty and charming spirit.

In Leroy Scott's latest story "Folly's Gold" (Houghton, Mifflin. \$2.00), the two chief characters are Clifford, a young detective, and Bradley, an unscrupulous ex-chief of detectives, who, the better to realize his dream of becoming a master-criminal—the greatest of all crooks—develops a polished exterior, acquires the outer marks of refinement and cultivates the friendship of the social élite. The scene of his criminal operations is the City of Folly; the mine from which he draws his wealth is found in the secret follies of the rich; hence the title. Though Clifford succeeds time and again in checkmating Bradley, it is only when he is on the verge of apparent failure that he realizes in part his ambition to expose the blackmailer and bring him to justice.

It is not every novelist's good fortune to succeed in making his characters reveal themselves in their own conversations. It is easier for the writer to tell us in his own words what they feel and think, their suspicions, doubts and convictions, their fears and hopes. In "Mezzanine" (Doran. \$2.00), E. F. Benson has chosen rather the latter course, though he has not wholly neglected the better way. The theme of his story is the problem of whether a wife some ten years older than her husband can retain his love when a younger woman is angling for it. The assumption of the story would seem to be that it is almost impossible for two Christians so situated to be happy and for the husband to remain faithful. Were it a question of two pagans there might be plausibility in the plot. The ethics of the closing pages must certainly be condemned.

Communications

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department.

The Woman's Side of It

To the Editor of AMERICA:

After reading Mary Gordon's wise and courageous article, I was astounded that all the replies either did not see the point or seeing it did not agree.

That Mary Gordon lacked spirituality, trust in God; that she is impractical and a dreamer; entered married life with undue haste, without sufficient knowledge of its responsibilities—these are most unjust criticisms. I have not the pleasure of that fearless lady's acquaintance, but I will warrant she possesses the proper trust in God.

Her desires or demands are fair and natural. Mary Gordon objects not to the children with whom God has blessed or will bless her; she merely wants a home of her own, a breathing space between the little ones' visitations to regain her strength—and I might add to recoup her finances. The great love we have for our children will not pay the bills for their coming, food and clothing (bargain-counter shopping is not always a saving). The satisfaction of these desires and an education for the children are the things for which we all pray, and while we pray for them, we should work for them, not against them. We trust in God but are not presumptuous, expecting Him to extract us from difficulties into which we walk with our eyes open.

To advocate self-restraint and self-denial is not un-Christian or modernistic; while our Lord preached trust in the Father, He taught that doctrine in all things. Why then exclude it from the intimate domestic relations?

I am proud and happy to say my husband endorsed Mary Gordon's splendid article.

Philadelphia.

CATHERINE R. FARLEY.

Three Sacred Paintings

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Please pardon the liberty I take in writing to you, but a week ago we received a letter from one of our monasteries of Rouen, in which they make the following request:

A poor expelled Community desires to sell three large paintings which adorned their chapel, in order to secure some resources. They are considered very valuable, especially that representing the Flight into Egypt. Another represents the Assumption and the third the Immaculate Conception. If you can insert a notice of these paintings in a journal or paper in your country, these good Mothers will be profoundly grateful. The seller is Mr. Morel, Place de la Rougemare 8, Rouen, Seine Inférieure France. He will give all information and send photographs if desired.

This is a copy of part of the letter, and it occurred to us that perhaps some of the readers of your valued AMERICA might be interested since AMERICA did so much for the war-sufferers in Religion.

Riverdale-on-Hudson, N. Y.

SR. M. FRANCES REYNOLDS.

The Leper Fund

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The annual Christmas appeal of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith for the lepers has grown to be not so much a direct plea for alms as an opportunity for the most practical manifestation of the true Christmas spirit.

In sponsoring the appeal for the Leper Fund this year, the Society stresses primarily the motives that should influence Catholics to contribute rather than the contributions themselves.

The most abject of men, outcasts of humanity, abandoned in desolate places to a living death, the lepers are deserted by everyone except by those who are carrying on the work of our Divine Saviour for the afflicted.

How well the injunction of Jesus Christ to bring the Gospel

to all men has been obeyed is illustrated in no more striking manner than in the achievements of heroic missionary nuns among the lepers. At one colony in particular, that of Culion in the Pacific, eighty-five per cent of the unfortunates who are released by death receive the Last Sacraments of the Church. In death, as in life, they find their sole consolation in the Catholic teachings and practices.

A demonstration of the genuine Christmas spirit is certain to bring to the lives of the poor leper outcasts the only ray of happiness from a world they believe wants to forget them. It will make more endurable the contact missionaries are obliged to maintain with these remnants of humanity and it will bring down upon the heads of the charitable givers the blessings of Him who promised reward everlasting to those who comforted "the least of these, His friends."

Contributions to the Fund are being received at Diocesan Offices or at the National Office of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 109 East 38th Street, New York City.

New York.

MGR. WILLIAM QUINN,
National Director.

Mexico and the A. F. of L.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am again writing your excellent publication to comment upon events of the last few months in the Mexican situation, as applied to organized labor.

Those of us here who took an active interest in this matter feel that the discussion, or rather lack of discussion, at the A. F. of L. Convention, was not all that could have been wished. However, the objective desire of getting this subject before the rank and file was achieved and we can await results.

I beg your indulgence here in mentioning some phases of the case as applied to all concerned. For instance your esteemed co-worker, Father Husslein, says in the July issue of the *Sacred Heart Messenger* that the chief trouble with some of our Catholic leaders seems to be that they are not well enough grounded in their Faith. This is without a doubt, true, but not in this specific case, for I know one of those who defended the Federation's attitude to be well instructed, if that is being well grounded, and that might explain the contention that they were not fooled.

As for myself I will say that I am one of the rascals of the Catholic Church who knows what he ought to do, and sometimes goes ahead and does it, at least will not shift the blame on those responsible for my early bringing up. So if I have erred in this matter I shall take my medicine gracefully.

As for being fooled, Mr. Gompers himself gave us a good lead to follow in this respect when discussing Bolshevism with a certain college professor, by remarking that perhaps Foster fooled him, "I am hard to fool and he fooled me."

To sum it all up, you took the right position in the matter in the beginning and held to it all through, and a great lot of good has been done thereby, and we would not have you recede a particle.

Pittsburgh.

J. E. LOVETT.

Militant, Virile Catholicism Needed

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Nothing is more disgusting than the weak-kneed, spineless Catholic, who feels perfectly at home with his prayer-book in church, but who is awkwardly out of place should his prayer-beads come tumbling out of his pocket, in a public thoroughfare, when he desired nothing more than to extricate his handkerchief in a time of emergency.

This type of Catholic—and needless to say, such a type exists—apparently considers the Catholic religion the best on the market for future results, but for this present, work-a-day world, well, one must be broad-minded, you know—such a mixture of races and creeds—one must be careful not to offend those

holding religious views at variance with the Creed of Rome. And yet, this same man's consternation at the untimely appearance of his prayer-beads would be wholly due to his well-grounded fears that barbed shafts and ironic remarks would be directed his way by his Protestant friends, on account of devotion to Our Lady.

Let, for instance, the much-vaunted Dr. Cadman concede a point in favor of the Church of Rome, during one of his Sunday afternoon lectures, and this gentleman can hardly wait until Monday morning to greet his Protestant friends with a eulogy of this same Dr. Cadman—never adverting to the fact that the radio orator was but simply stating the truth or reciting a fact of history, and in so doing, merited no undue praise, unless honesty is more rare than we would feel inclined to admit.

During political discussions, this type of Catholic is continually in hot water—on pins and needles—so to speak, lest the name of Al Smith be introduced, for lo! what have we here, his friends may foolishly say, but an inter-mixing of Church and State—religion and politics, and this cannot be. Of course, he is apparently oblivious of the fact that once the ingredients became available, his Protestant friends willingly began the mixing.

Permit a man in high public office to condemn, openly, the Klan, and immediately that worthy gentleman is eternally enshrined in the heart of our prayer-book friend, and for no other reason than that the public official was acting with the Constitution of the United States as his guide.

Such Catholics, we have legions of them; but what to do with them is the problem. For the most part their sycophancy and their grovelling attitude before our separated brethren is entirely unconscious. It is, one might truthfully state, innate, a part of their being. They have, in some way or another, come to look upon all Protestants as great, luminous bodies and they themselves, but mere shadows, reflections, of the same.

It is said of Daniel O'Connell, that he made the Irishmen and women of his time conscious of their dignity and raised them, in their own estimation to the social level of princes and lords, and for this alone is worthy of the title, "Liberator."

If we had a Daniel O'Connell who could rattle our vast Catholic population out of the inferior-complex rut, into which it has slipped, our participation in the affairs of State might be more in keeping with our numerical strength.

A militant, virile Catholic laity is what we want. Is it possible?
North Barnstead, N. H. JAMES F. DESMOND.

Federal Agencies Only May Enforce Prohibition Amendment To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your criticism of the portion of President Coolidge's message which says: "Under the Constitution the States are jointly charged with the nation in providing for the enforcement of the Prohibition Amendment," is just. There is, in addition to the reasons given by you, another reason why the Eighteenth Amendment contains no mandate to the States.

The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly said that the Amendment is a grant of power to the National Government and is not the source of the power of the States to enforce prohibition. The only Government with power to enforce the prohibition of the Amendment is the National Government.

The States, the Court has said, had power to enforce the prohibition before the Amendment and they did not surrender their power over that subject by the Amendment. In enforcing prohibition, therefore, the States act under their own power and not under the power of the Amendment. It is because these independent sovereignties have jurisdiction over the same subject in the same place that the Supreme Court of the United States has sanctioned convictions in both State and Federal Courts for the same act of violation of the prohibition laws, it being held that the offender has by his action transgressed the laws of the nation and the laws of the State.

The Amendment having been thus interpreted by the Supreme Court, it follows that the States are under no obligation to enforce the power therein delegated to the National Government. It also follows that there is no justification for "the President's condemnation of the sovereign States whose citizens have declined to enact legislation to enforce the Amendment, or for his statement that such action by sovereign States is an evasion, to shift the burden wholly upon Federal agencies," the truth being that the Amendment itself places the burden of enforcing its powers wholly upon Federal agencies.

Philadelphia.

R. B.

A Protestant Champion of Calles

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am appending to this communication an account of a clash at the close of a Protestant minister's lecture on Mexico, before the Alumni Club of the University of Buffalo, which may serve two purposes.

In the first place it certainly confirms the fact that certain Protestant elements are supporting Calles in his campaign of extermination against the Church in Mexico. Sidney Sutherland in *Liberty* puts the case against these allies of the Mexican Nero most forcibly:

The American dupes [invited visiting committees] know it all after ten days of skillfully conducted rubbernecking! . . . Most of them at once indorse the Calles campaign. . . . against the Catholic Church in Mexico. Selected because they are Protestants with access to Protestant publicists, they joyously behold the anxiety and woes of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Sutherland claims to be no brief-bearer for the Church in Mexico, but even as a Protestant, he says, "I do not think it quite the sporting thing to do, to come down here and gloat over the grief of a country bereft of its solace and its Faith." The truth of his charge is exemplified in the appended account from the *Buffalo News* of December 14.

The second purpose of the story may be to make us thankful for well-informed and fearless Catholic laymen. The account was headed: "Clash Enlivens Dr. Krumbine's Talk on Mexico." The challenger of the Pastor's statements was Mr. T. F. Hurley, formerly of the University of Mexico Faculty. The *News* wrote:

Mr. Hurley challenged Dr. Krumbine's statement that the Mexican business man, the Mexican native and the illiterate Indian favored the policy adopted by the Government. Mr. Hurley declared the only reason there was not a revolution in Mexico today was because the Catholic Church preferred to avoid a revolution.

Quoting the words of Mr. Hurley, the account then continued:

Dr. Krumbine says also that the Catholic Church has neglected a great opportunity in Mexico in regard to education. I would call your attention to the fact that when the Church was in ascendance the land from north to south and from east to west was dotted with schools and churches in which were people whose lives were dedicated to the education of the children, to charity for those who needed it and for the care of the sick.

Another point on which the two men differed was in their opinions of President Calles.

"Calles," said Dr. Krumbine, "is evidently a man of intelligence and one who is open and willing to reveal his opinions on any question concerning Mexico's present status."

"Calles," said Mr. Hurley, "is an ignoramus. Why, I myself heard him say that only twelve years back he was assistant to a blacksmith in the hills."

Mr. Hurley characterized the present constitution as unconstitutional. . . . It had never been submitted to the people for ratification. Dr. Krumbine held that the constitution was valid in that it had been adopted in the same manner as its predecessors.

The speech of this Protestant "Doctor" confirmed the charge made by Sidney Sutherland, but he never counted upon the presence at his lecture of an upstanding Catholic like T. F. Hurley, God bless him!

Buffalo.

E. P. S.